

## Appendix C Focus Group Meetings

**March 15, 2007**

**Ministry Teams Meeting**

ATTENDEES: See Attached Sign-in Sheet First Unitarian Universalist representatives

Robin Bush Southern Cross Property Consultants  
Alison M. Whitelaw Platt/Whitelaw, Architects, Inc.  
Todd S. Lukas Platt/Whitelaw, Architects, Inc.

SUBJECT: The purpose of the meeting was to solicit input from leaders of the Ministry Teams.

Attachments: Agenda. Sign-in Sheet

---

1. Program and Worship (Arvid)
  - a. Looking Glass theater may need to be given the opportunity to provide specific input, specifically for lighting issues.
  - b. Improvements to the campus wide technology, specifically networking capabilities.
2. In-Reach (Suzette) - Providing Community building
  - a. Various sized groups.
  - b. Food friendly spaces needed.
  - c. Increase storage availability.
  - d. Appropriate areas when child-care is provided during event/meetings.
  - e. Campus lighting at night. Ability to control interior lighting (i.e. dimming and banks)
  - f. Outdoor activity space for young adults and families.
3. Social Justice
  - a. Has 19 sub groups and affiliates. Not all meet on-site.
  - b. Small meeting room needs except when whole group meets, Bard Hall size accommodations are needed (and possibly growing).
  - c. A/V media equipment (movable).
4. Storage for coffee. (Fund raising free trade storage)
5. Sunday morning signage can be cluttered. Provide specific locations for information boards.
6. Provide dedicated meeting rooms vs. set-up/take down needed, fixed projection etc.
7. Plateau – what can be done with it to enhance the property? Past ideas include: housing, outdoor theater, playground, exterior useable area. It may be a sacred space with remains.
8. Sunday – not enough facilities for all the activities desired. i.e. Can't serve breakfast, or provide adult education due to lack of space. The church will be providing Wednesday night programming to reach out to the congregation, specifically families.
9. Parking – a joint use parking structure on UU property was previously considered with UCSD. Improving the parking is a well noted concern for all church users.
10. Kitchen – it is important to the ministry team group use (and many others) and needs to be large enough to accommodate all the user groups and functions.

## End of Comments

---

*Should the content of this report differ from the recollection of any attendee, she/he will notify the Architect in writing of the discrepancy within five days of receiving the report, or at the next meeting. Absent this notification, this report shall stand as an accurate representation of events.*

**March 8, 2007**

**Administration Meeting**

ATTENDEES:           Theleste Stewart                               First Unitarian Universalist- Church  
Administrator

                          Matthew Boomhower                               Southern Cross Property Consultants  
                          Alison M. Whitelaw                               Platt/Whitelaw, Architects, Inc.  
                          Todd S. Lukas                                       Platt/Whitelaw, Architects, Inc.

SUBJECT:            The purpose of the meeting was to solicit input from the  
                          administration.

Attachments:        Agenda. Administrator's 'Comments for Architects'

---

1. Parking. Thelest provided the current lease agreement with ACE.
  - a. Pay station parking had been attempted – resulted in lost revenues.
  - b. Current staffing by ACE is to 8:00 PM Mon-Saturday.
  - c. Congregation receives validation or permit sticker – member, staff, preschool categories.
  - d. Preschool is satisfied with current parking allocated, ACE would prefer to reclaim those.
  - e. There are not enough spaces for staff parking (generally along service drive).
  - f. Current rates for parking are less than at Mercy Hospital.
  - g. UCSD users of UU surface parking include: staff, visitors, and first time users. Lack of visibility of the parking structure may contribute to this.
  - h. Church purchases parking for congregants at the health center's garage for Sat/Sun events.
  - i. SCPC has a meeting scheduled with representatives of UCSD to discuss shared parking agreement.
  - j. There are currently 137 parking spaces. The meeting house seats 500.
  - k. Mid-week large scale functions (i.e. memorials) are extremely difficult to accommodate and manage.
  - l. If/when health center garage goes to an automated system, the church will continue to purchase parking although the use of 'codes' to identify users to system is unclear.
  - m. The church has been informed that the health center does not currently have enough parking available, regardless of changes to the function of the facility. The un-improved lot is assumed to be a long term surface parking are for health center employees/staff.
  - n. Additional shared parking with area clinics has been rumored but no agreement currently exists.
  - o. Off-site parking with shuttle service might be considered.
  - p. Available parking for the second service on Sundays is minimal.
  - q. Separate long term and short term (30 min) parking should be identified.

2. Room Use

- a. A schedule was provided by Thelest showing the current room user and group for the campus. In general, scheduled events can cover up to 16 hours of any given day of the week.
  - b. The majority of users are 'in-house' church groups although some outside groups continue to utilize the campus. (i.e. Amnesty International, UCSD patient support, and Dignity). Utilization by outside groups serves as a revenue source for the church.
  - c. While the demand has increased due to the remodel of room 113, it remains underutilized. As well, the senior and junior rooms do not setup well for adult meeting rooms.
3. Conditional Use Permit (CUP)
- a. There is no additional information available for the current CUP under which the church occupies its current location. A box of archive material titled 'renovation' will be made available by Thelest to SCPC and P/WA to research.
4. Maintenance and Operations
- a. The church is 'behind' in its ongoing efforts to clean the campus.
  - b. There is currently 1 custodian, and a need for another full time position. The current staff has little time to clean and acts as a 'day attendant' providing setup and breakdown of rooms. (Table, chairs, AV etc)
  - c. While both the boiler room and the 'shop' have adequate space, remote maintenance closets are needed throughout the campus.
  - d. Some finishes are a challenge to maintain, and walk off mats and other accessories would aid in extending the life of some surfaces.
  - e. Grounds maintenance is currently provided by a contracted service. Future needs might require a knowledgeable gardener in addition to maintaining the grounds keeping service.
  - f. ACE is contracted to maintain the parking lot although garbage accumulates at the church's identifying stone at the northeast corner of the lot and 1<sup>st</sup> UU staff often provides cleanup there.
5. Canyon
- a. A fuel modification plan and an overall strategy to mitigate the interface between the natural growths of the canyon and the infrastructure of the buildings is needed.
  - b. Water Quality Control Plan to identify and describe the strategy to control and/or treat storm water from the site prior to entering the canyon is necessary. The extent of quantities and controls is unknown and will require the input of a civil engineer.
6. Administration Building – a list of comments was provided by Thelest for review and discussion. (attached)

- a. Security – improvements to the layout of the building should include a buffer between public and administrative and ministerial staff offices, and a strategy for security/locking of building.
- b. Physical access and protection of the computer server should be improved. Current off-site storage of electronic backups of information is in place.
- c. The reception area is a ‘bottleneck’ space where social interchanges take place, although it does not stem the flow of people to interior spaces and staff.
- d. Volunteers require access to mailboxes in workroom and copier use, although the continuation and extents of the latter are decreasing. This need results in high activity within the reception area and should be remotely located from staff.
- e. A room for breaks/meals is needed for staff.
- f. The coordinators (current and future) and interns duties often require private meetings with congregants. Cubicle spaces might not be adequate if small offices can be provided. Alternately, a small conference accessed by these users might accommodate their needs.

7. General/Other

- a. An improved separation between administrative staff/functions and pastoral staff/functions is needed, while the overlapping staff needs are acknowledged.
- b. Storage for drawings and certain archive materials is needed.
- c. The church owns several pieces of art that should have improved environmental and security provisions.
- d. Thought should be given to the dual use of the multi-purpose room and art gallery as some displays can be offensive to some building users.
- e. Whole site emergency alarm, security and access control (keying, electronic pads) needs much improved structure and control.
- f. Full time reception-only staff with an improved phone system is needed.
- g. Possible groupings of staff are suggested as follows:

Religious Education + Youth Coord.

In-Reach Coord. + Pastors + Interns + Young Adult Coord.

Administration staff + Bookkeeper

End of Comments

---

*Should the content of this report differ from the recollection of any attendee, she/he will notify the Architect in writing of the discrepancy within five days of receiving the report, or at the next meeting. Absent this notification, this report shall stand as an accurate representation of events.*

**March 8, 2007  
Meeting**

**Environmental / Patio Focus  
Master Planning Phase**

ATTENDEES: See attached sign-in sheet

SUBJECT: Focus group on environment (EarthSpirit) and 'Patio'. The purpose of the meeting was to solicit input from congregant and user groups.

Attachments: Agenda – Includes background information provided by P/WA and EarthSpirit input sheet.  
Sign in sheet

- 
1. John Holl began the meeting with the invocation.  
John notes that if the faith and scripture of the church represents the congregation's heart, and the facilities represent it's body, the patio and the interaction that occurs there, represent's the church's soul.
  2. AW introduced issues of environmental awareness and climate change, significant and related to the architectural community and potentially to the church's master planning approach. Specifically offered was the U.S. Mayor's agreement, the 2030 Challenge and the Living Building Challenge.
  3. Marge Wurgel offered the EarthSpirit Team's input (see attached) and noted that the group endorsed all the items therein except: restoration of the plateau.
  4. It was noted that the site may be within the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) boundaries.  
P/WA to investigate and identify boundaries.
  5. Flexibility of spaces, to all users at all times, to accommodate multiple uses should result in less overall impact on the site.
  6. If the plateau is restored, how would, or can an accessible path be provided?
  7. South Bay Campus and Parking: if it becomes a reality, assume that both campuses will grow. The current 'cap' to this campus is the parking – no known cap/target for overall congregation growth in strategic plan. The history of UU has been to foster other churches and congregations. South Bay would be formed under an 'alternative' model. Can shuttle service to off-site locations be provided in lieu of adding new parking?
  8. The EarthSpirit group would like to see the campus implement xeriscape principles with a focus on native plants to allow the church to 'walk the talk.
  9. A comprehensive landscape plan should include informational signage.
  10. Volunteer upkeep of the grounds is not sufficient.
  11. The patio area would accommodate more year-round and more often usage if cover/shade is provided. This might be operable to respond to changing conditions.
  12. More solar panels for energy production should be used and might be beneficial to incorporate into the patio/design scheme to become more visible to the congregation as it reflects UU values. EarthSpirit has discussed a need for creative funding for PVs.
  13. Solar hot water and tankless hot water heaters are desired.
  14. Automatic controls at toilet rooms to reduce maintenance and conserve water.

15. If possible, introduce a greywater or rainwater collection system(s) for water re-use.
16. Can a connection to UC Health Center recycled water be made? The current city generated re-used water system has excess capacity. Investigate possible links.
17. With respect to the landscaping desires, it is noted that the 'right' landscape architect be selected to manage water use and provide appropriate professional guidance. Also, it is recommended that the use of climate control sensors (and possibly instant conditions access/input) be utilized.
18. The periphery of the site as it interacts with the canyons should be native plantings. The appropriateness of removing non-natives at these areas to replace with new is noted should be considered.
  
19. It is noted that at the master plan level, landscaping will not be very detailed, but will be given consideration for future input.
20. The memorial wall (and the future memorials) should be integrated into the master plan.
21. Will a temporary memorial wall be in place until construction occurs, and what will be the timing? Can 'phasing' been shown in the master plan so that people will be informed?
22. The lawn area(s) are ideal for children's use and the identified 'use of space' should be carefully considered. Children also are drawn to the fountain and shouldn't be limited in their enjoyment.
23. The patio use consists of (but is not limited to): church social gathering space, picnics, pledge drives, weddings, and is integrated with interior gatherings and functions. The patio acts as a community building.
24. An indoor/outdoor connection to aid in creating one integrated large space is recommended.
25. Shade/rain structure and night lighting is desired. There is positive support for shade trees although the resulting required maintenance is acknowledged.
26. The master plan should reflect an overall 'flow' through the site – from the eastern entry to the canyons.
27. Recycling (and possibly composting) should be provided. Locations should be useful and accessible. Currently, a contracted service removes trash and recyclables from the campus.
28. The multi-use of spaces (fixed vs. flexibility) remains a priority. The benefits and challenges of movable partitions should be considered where appropriate.
29. The patio should be like a 'park setting' and users should feel like they are in a 'sacred space' when on the campus. It must remain a multi-user, multi-function space.
30. The turn-around is an underutilized area, parking should be banned. It is noted that the stone in the island matches the stone in the fountain and is currently overlooked.
31. The policy of not walking by the windows of the meeting house during a service is often not headed. Also, the headlights of cars focus directly into the meeting house.
32. UC has cleared brush and eucalyptus (fire prevention) and the parking garage is now more visible.
33. If informed, environmental, solar, and solar collection materials and systems might be funded *because* of what they are.

34. L.E.E.D. certification is not necessarily the goal. A responsible and healthy facility is. (It is noted that the national UU organization provides some funding for facilities attempting a LEED certification)
35. Expression and/or education of the environmental success and building function/operations should be provided in a thoughtful and discreet way. (similar to landscape signage)
36. Can a bridge be provided to connect to the existing UCSD Health Center parking garage? The authorities that control the parking are remotely located in Oakland and the future use of the buildings is unknown.
37. Potable water should be supplied in lieu of bottled water to reduce need for plastic bottles and subsequent need for trash/recycling.
38. Parking considerations should reflect 1500-2000 users.
39. Broadcast of services might be required as meeting house reaches it's capacity.

End of Comments

---

*Should the content of this report differ from the recollection of any attendee, she/he will notify the Architect in writing of the discrepancy within five days of receiving the report, or at the next meeting. Absent this notification, this report shall stand as an accurate representation of events.*

**March 7, 2007**

**Universal Design Focus Meeting  
Master Planning Phase**

ATTENDEES: See attached sign-in sheet

SUBJECT: Focus group on Universal Design. The purpose of the meeting was to solicit input from congregant and user groups.

---

The following are comments, recommendations or desires expressed by the group:

1. Access to Meeting House – make access off of turn-around accessible and beautiful and provide more trees to screen the parking structure.
2. Provide electronic assist doors to mid-level entry to Meeting House where wheel chair seating accommodations are provided.
3. Improve the path of travel from the turn-around to the Meeting House and campus courtyard.
4. Provide appropriate slopes, improved lighting and tactile cues for the vision impaired.
5. Door 101 (the main entry to Meeting House) has no operable hardware at the exterior and needs signage.
6. Signage – Larger lettering, high contrast, with pictograms is needed throughout the campus.

7. Parking – there are not enough HCA spaces available. The space closest to the entry off the parking lot is difficult to maneuver into.
8. Access (for all) to environmental garden – doors are too heavy.
9. Access to site adjacent to staff parking is too steep.
10. Door out of Bard Hall (north at service drive) is heavy and has an elevated landing. Not accessible.
11. Pavement, especially bricked areas, are uneven
12. Provide railings at both sides of ramp(s).
13. At volunteer areas, provide accommodating clearances at work surfaces and equipment.
14. Provide kick-plates at all doors.
15. Improve all accessibility criteria at restrooms.
16. At chairlift, make it quiet and do not require a key to operate.
17. Provide access to plateau area (west of meeting house overlooking the canyon).
18. Use color contrast to define counter edges, knobs etc. Improve lighting throughout and provide dimmable fixtures and controls for candlelight services etc.
19. Offer provisions to accommodate service dogs and strollers in meeting house (and other multi-use areas).
20. Verify the ramp and door to the chapel meet accessibility requirements.
21. Provide audio/video connection between the Meeting house and Bard Hall.
22. Acoustics at the Meeting House need improvement.
23. Allow for exterior coffee service near the kitchen and provide electrical outlets.
24. Provide (accessible) drinking fountains at upper and lower levels of the courtyard.
25. Choir – improve ventilation at organ pipes and review height of railing. Choir uses monitors to view service (stage) due to impeded sightlines.

#### End of Comments

---

*Should the content of this report differ from the recollection of any attendee, she/he will notify the Architect in writing of the discrepancy within five days of receiving the report, or at the next meeting. Absent this notification, this report shall stand as an accurate representation of events.*

**February 28, 2007**

**Religious Education Meeting**

ATTENDEES: Liz Jones 1<sup>st</sup> UU Director of Religious Education  
Kathe Larick 1<sup>st</sup> UU Religious Education Assistant  
Alison M. Whitelaw Platt/Whitelaw, Architects, Inc.  
Todd S. Lukas Platt/Whitelaw, Architects, Inc.

SUBJECT: The purpose of the meeting was to solicit input from the Religious Education program.

---

The group walked the campus areas that the RE program utilized to discuss the uses and needs of the spaces.

The information provided may be for the room identified or for other areas as noted.

1. 115 Craftsroom. Generally craft storage, messy crafts with the ping pong table acting as large layout. Need a gross motor skill area. Would like volleyball or ½ court basketball. Storage for supplies used on Sunday in pre-school rooms. Stores left over rummage sale materials. Acts as staging area for theater production.  
Storage. Archives of education materials for RE, poster storage racks, tables, etc.
3. Off-site storage space for large seasonal storage (in loft now) is in budget.
4. 114B Senior High Room. 9-12 grade. Multi use with other groups (up to 20). Keep stained glass clerestory windows. Existing room heaters are noisy and less than attractive. Carpet is in poor condition. Natural ventilation is problematic.  
114B Storage Room. Room user storage, women's federation, AV.
5. 114A Junior High Room. Mult-use with other groups (up to 14). Built in seating is not appropriate for all users, would prefer moveable couches. Heater and carpet as stated above. Existing door to outside (butterfly garden).  
114A Storage Room. Room user storage with space to accommodate more.  
Moveable partitions were enclosed, not stable or enough separation provided.
5. 113 and 113B. Moveable partition remains. Seldom used as separate rooms. Used for homeless shelter 2 weeks/year through the shelter network. Used for family services. Misc. user groups included off campus groups. Used for 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> grade RE. Piano.  
Closets. Bulletin boards, education curricula, card stock, musical instruments, AV, chair desks.
6. Restrooms. Would like to allow for secured access for use dinner overnights (1/month) to relieve staff chaperones. Showers are used regularly.
7. 112 Common Room. Entry courtyard could be used for art projects. 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> grade RE use, food, dancing etc. Acoustics are difficult yet carpet would not be appropriate. Kitchen attracts mice and ants. Water heater in closet serves kitchen and showers, pipes run along rooftop – bathroom water is cold. Other uses include board meetings, outside groups receptions, small presentations, etc.  
Closets. AV, groups' storage, area rugs, tables and chairs, bulletin boards etc.

8. 111B Religious Education Office. Kathe office. Work products from RE activity on Sundays. Check-in and reception desk. Libraries for Re leaders, kids, parenting and social issues. RE group generated artwork display.  
RE Supply Room. 5/6<sup>th</sup> and 3/4<sup>th</sup> grade, general, adult education, craft supplies etc. Used heavily (to service pre-school rooms) on Sunday.  
Curriculum closet. Books, tapes, videos, snack supplies. Improvements being contracted.
9. Vision panels with blinds, and/or flyer display (room scheduling, announcements etc) on appropriate doors.
10. Pre-School office. No RE use.
  
11. 109 Classroom - Pre-school - Toddler / RE - 0-2 years. No RE storage. RE brings cribs, play chest, and manipulatives. ½ hour set-up time.
12. 107 Classroom – Pre-school 3½ -4 / RE 6-7 year (1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> grade). Furniture is too small, room is too small, play yard equip not appropriate. One small closet for RE Storage.
13. 105 Classroom - Pre-school - 2½ -3½ / RE – 2-3 years. Furniture, play yard equip appropriate. Small roll around storage unit used by RE. Interior connection to rest rooms, door direct to play yard. Also used for child care, wed evenings after church, and individual support groups.
14. 103 Classroom – Pre-school 4½ -5 / RE 4-5 years. Furniture, play yard equip appropriate. One small closet for RE Storage. Interior play structure offers visibility challenges.
15. Masonry screen is a seismic and climbing hazard.
16. Pre-school restrooms not used by RE. Theater group use for changing rooms.
17. Miscellaneous.
  - a. RE uses greeting garden often. Children groups and family picnics.
  - b. Currently there are approx. 200 children in the Sunday RE. Potential growth to 300.
  - c. Could use one more room to meet exist needs, although changing demographics determine space needs.
  - d. Children leave service early and classes run longer than services.
  - e. Children’s chapel service – would like chair storage for seating on steps. (4-5 occasions / year)
  - f. Walks to plateau for nature excursions. Access is a problem; via chapel or past meeting house windows.

## End of Comments

---

*Should the content of this report differ from the recollection of any attendee, she/he will notify the Architect in writing of the discrepancy within five days of receiving the report, or at the next meeting. Absent this notification, this report shall stand as an accurate representation of events.*

## Appendix D Campus Renovation Team Minutes

First Unitarian Universalist Church of San Diego  
Campus Renovation Committee Meeting  
May 17, 2007

The meeting was called to order in Room 113 at 4:13 PM by Convener John Holl

Those in attendance: Alison Whitelaw, Todd Lucas, Matthew Boomhower, Robin Bush, John Holl, Andy French, Mary Rose, Eli Shefter, Thelest Stewart, and Kath Hillery,

1) Todd Lucas presented a much more detailed Master Plan based on the Plan agreed by the CRT on 4-23-2007.

- Program, meeting, and office space would be increased 4,500 square feet by constructing second floor additions to a totally renovated or reconstructed Bard Hall, the Administration Building, and Religious Education Wing and connected by a second level walkway. This could be accomplished in phases with Bard Hall most likely being addressed as phase I.
- The plan is predicated on the concept of an esthetically pleasing, functional parking structure. Three levels would be necessary to replace current parking spaces; four or five levels would supply the increase that the city may mandate and provide more income. Financing would be developed through commercial loans or an agreement with an outside developer. The alternative, no parking structure, would leave us virtually dependent on a shared parking agreement with UCSD or another lot, with fewer parking spots, and a decreased revenue stream.
- Two meetings within the next with city planning will tell us what problems we may encounter and may force us to reconsider certain options.

2) The Campus Renovation Team continues to be in unanimous support of the above approach.

3) The Campus Master Plan will be reported to the Congregation at a meeting between services on Sunday, June 10, 2007 (approximately 10:40 to 11:20). John Holl will introduce the program and make a few comments. A CRT report will be distributed with a form for comments. Alison Whitelaw will present the plan. Thelest will assure us that we have a sound technician and John will have the video projector ready. Matthew will be available.

4) Action Items:

- Alison and Todd meet with city officials
- Alison, Matthew, and John meet June 5 to rehearse June 10 meeting
- John previews his presentation to Church Board June 5
- John has reminder article in *Window* of June 6
- Ed Law explores possibility of outside financing for Parking Structure
- Todd prepares illustrations that be posted on Church web site for viewing after June 10.
- Matthew explores possibility of high level meeting with UCSD after June 10 meeting.

- CRT members available at June 10 meeting and for Sunday patio table in June to receive comments.
- No May 23 meeting unless notified.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:40 pm

Respectfully submitted,

John Holl

First Unitarian Universalist Church of San Diego  
Campus Renovation Committee Meeting  
April 23, 2007

The meeting was called to order in Room 113 at 4:32 PM by Convener John Holl

Those in attendance: Alison Whitelaw, Todd Lucas, Matthew Boomhower, Robin Bush, John Holl, Andy French, Mary Rose, Ed Law, Thelest Stewart, and Kath Hillery,

1) Alison discussed the First Unitarian Universalist Master Plan

- Adequate parking constitutes a major problem and a significant issue that must be addressed if we are to obtain San Diego City approval for any renovation. Possible approaches are:
  - Build our own parking structure either above ground or subterranean financed either by the church and/or an outside developer.
  - Negotiate a shared use agreement with UCSD Medical Center or other parking venue.
- Room utilization analysis would suggest at least 5000 square feet additional is required to meet our current and projected programming needs.
- It is concluded that the architectural team can design the rooms, but the ministry teams and administration must develop strategies to more efficiently and effectively use room space.
- Four campus renovation master plans were discussed:
  - Second floor additions to Bard Hall and Administration with possibility of a second floor addition to RE Building.
  - Addition buildings in the west end of the existing parking lot and a subterranean backing structure to the east end of the lot.
  - A major above ground parking structure to the east end of the parking lot and two variations of revisions and additions to existing buildings.

2) The consensus was that a phased first option (*Second floor additions to Bard Hall and Administration with possibility of a second floor addition to RE Building*) with consideration of a jointly funded (church and developer) above ground stylish parking structure is most suitable.

3) It was noted that our activity should continue on at least three fronts:

- The architects will continue to work on the consensus option (see above) and will have a “conversation” with the city planners regarding the feasibility of the option.
- Matthew Boomhower will follow up on and prepare for a joint meeting with UCSD regarding parking issues.
- Someone (yet to be determined) will begin exploring possibility of joint venturing with outside developers.

We look forward to hearing of progress on these three fronts at our next meeting.

4) It is still our intention to be able to report and possibly present our consensus plan at the June 10, 2007 Congregational meeting. It has been suggested that:

- We hold two sessions (one after the first service and the second as a part of the Congregational meeting after the second service).
- The CRT, specifically John Holl, will introduce the topic and deflect some of the comments from the consultants.
- John Holl will arrange for the room and audiovisual and will do the advance publicity in the *Window*.

5) Following our public exposure on June 10, CRT will continue to meet to support the architectural team and to strategize our process. We do not plan to enlarge our committee during this period. When a plan is more congregationally accepted we will consider developing committees dedicated to special projects. This will require more members.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:40pm

Respectfully submitted,

John Holl

## Campus Renovation Team Upcoming Meetings

Date	Time	Room	Chair	Subject
Thursday, May 17, 2007	4-6:15	113	Alison	Review development of selected plan
Wednesday, May 23, 2007	4-6:30	113	John	Plan for congregation meeting
Sunday, June 10, 2007	10:30-11:15 12:45-1:15	Bard Hall Meeting House	John	Congregational Update

First Unitarian Universalist Church of San Diego  
Campus Renovation Committee Meeting  
March 29, 2007

The meeting was called to order in the Chapel at 4:05 PM by Convener John Holl

Those in attendance: Alison Whitelaw, Todd Lucas, Robin Bush, John Holl, Andy French, Eli Shefter, Thelest Stewart, and Kath Hillery,

- Todd presented updated aerial views of the campus showing the property lines and prevailing wind directions. Attention to water drainage will be important.
- Alison reviewed the input from the well attended focus groups.
- Major Issues identified were parking, universal design, quantity & variety of meeting spaces due to scheduling crunches, expanded capacity for worship services (overflow spaces), improved visual connection between Meeting House and exterior environment, upgraded communications technology, environmental stewardship, architectural identity, wayfinding & exterior lighting, flexibility for future growth/re-structuring, useable exterior areas, use of the plateau & relationship to canyon, appropriate landscaping, integration of memorial wall expansion, facilitation of maintenance and operations, and security.
- Of foremost concern in the permitting process will be demonstrating that we have adequate parking especially for Sunday services. At best we are just marginal. Most likely we will have to be creative in shared use agreements with existing parking. Much discussion of this issue followed.

Our next meeting will be Monday, April 23, 2007, 4:30-6:15 in Room 113 at which time we may preliminary concepts to review.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:20pm

Respectfully submitted,

John Holl

## Campus Renovation Team Upcoming Meetings

Date	Time	Room	Chair	Subject
Thursday, March 29, 2007	4-6:30pm	Chapel	Alison	Feed back from sub committees
Monday, April 23, 2007	4:30-6:30	113	Alison	Review plan alternates
Thursday, May 17, 2007	4-6:15	113	Alison	Review development of selected plan
Wednesday, May 23, 2007	4-6:30	113	John	Plan for congregation meeting

First Unitarian Universalist Church of San Diego  
Campus Renovation Committee Meeting  
January 18, 2007

The meeting was called to order at 4:05 PM by Convener John Holl

Those in attendance: Alison Whitelaw, , Matthew Boomhower, Robin Bush, John Holl, Mary Rose, Ed Law, Andy French, Eli Shefter, Thelest Stewart, and Arvid Straube

Alison and Matthew outlined what would be involved with the development of a Master Plan prior to and in anticipation of a Phase 1 project that addresses the current situation in Bard Hall. Time: 4-6 months Expense: Platt-Whitelaw \$47,255; \$23,000; Total \$70,255. Possible alternatives, effect on the Pledge Drive, need for integration with the Strategic Plan, decision making process, and input that will be required from CRT were discussed.

*It was agreed unanimously to authorize Platt-Whitelaw/Southern Cross to proceed with the Master Plan.*

- Six subgroups will be interviewed:

Group	Organizer	Comments
Pre-school	Robin Bush	Robin will arrange preliminary meeting with Patty, Liz, John H., Becca Karpinski
Religious Education	Liz Jones	
Disabled Access	John Holl	Andy French would like to be included
Administration	Thelest S.	
Patio/Environmental	John Holl	
Ministerial Team Council	Arvid Straube	Most likely a special meeting

- CRT will identify key individuals that should be invited specifically. (please review attached Subgroup Key Individuals sheet and return with suggestions)
- John Holl will attend all the sessions and help with congregational input integration

The next CRT will be scheduled as the needs of the Alison and Matthew become evident. We will try to be flexible and respectful of Arvid's busy schedule.

Respectfully submitted,  
John Holl, convener

## Appendix E Campus Renovation Team Reports

# First Unitarian Universalist Church of San Diego

## Campus Renovation Team Report

### June 10, 2007

**Foreword:** The Campus Renovation Team (CRT) proudly presents this report and master plan for growing First Unitarian Universalist Church of San Diego well into the 21<sup>st</sup> century. After nearly eighteen months of input, study, and deliberation, the plan developed by Platt Whitelaw Architects, Southern Cross Property Associates, and the staff and Congregational members of CRT is now submitted for acceptance and action. The plan addresses and is consistent with the Strategic Plan of the Church. (2007-2012)

**Background and History:** First Church, has occupied this Arbor Street location, its sixth since it was chartered in 1887, from 1959 until the present. The Administration building and Religious Education wing were added to the three original buildings; the campus/parking lot was expanded to Front Street by the purchase of two existing residences in the 1970's. The Meeting House renovation was completed in 2004. Of the three original buildings, Bard Hall is now most in need of renovation due to electrical, plumbing and kitchen deterioration.

#### **Campus Design Challenges:**

- **Program/Office Space:** An estimated minimum of at least 5,000 sq. ft. are needed to meet current needs; this may double in the future if the Congregation continues to grow. In addition the Congregation must be more efficient in scheduling and designing multiple task spaces.
- **Parking:** In order to be approved for city construction permits and to comply with zoning, more parking spaces must be provided. This might be accomplished by a joint use agreement with University of California San Diego (UCSD) or another partner or by construction of a parking structure on our campus.
- **UCSD:** An Agreement of understanding with UCSD regarding further growth, program interactions, parking (see above), and use of adjoining canyon land must be explored.
- **Canyon:** Compliance with San Diego city canyon zoning; of our approximate 11.5 acres, of which only two acres are flat and usable. Any change to the campus must allow for storm water drainage.
- **Ecologic Harmony:** Design must incorporate energy conservation, utilize materials and methods that reflect minimizing resource depletion, and attend to appropriate waste disposal. Solar heating and/or electrical generation should be considered.
- **Safety/Accessibility/Security:** Redesign of the pre-school building must incorporate safety codes established by the state of California for pre-schools. All new renovation of buildings and patio must comply with the federal/state Disability Acts. Reasonable security must be assured.
- **Aesthetics and Church Recognition:** A campus easily recognizable to the visitor and one that is esthetically integrated and reflects our theological tradition is of great concern.

**Recommendations:** The CRT unanimously endorses the Master Plan submitted by Platt Whitelaw Architects. Several points need to be reinforced:

- This plan addresses more satisfactorily the points listed above.

- The plan can be phased over a longer time period which may facilitate less campus disruption and fit more with our ability to finance.
- The plan addresses Bard Hall first, but it leads into the other projects in an integrated manner.

**Approach:** The proposed plan and this report are to be presented at the Annual Congregational Meeting, June 10, 2007. The architects will continue with more specific plans for the first phase of renovation. More information will be distributed to the Congregation during the summer culminating with formal presentations in August. In early September, a Special Congregational Meeting will be convened to authorize a Capital Fund Drive to fund Phase I.

The Campus Renovation Committee of the CRT

John Holl, convener; Kath Hillery; Ed Law, Mary Rose; Eli Shefter; Andy French; Dave Hunt; Arvid Straube; and Thelest Stewart

First Unitarian Universalist Church of San Diego  
 Campus Renovation Committee Meeting  
 January 18, 2007

The meeting was called to order at 4:05 PM by Convener John Holl

Those in attendance: Alison Whitelaw, , Matthew Boomhower, Robin Bush, John Holl, Mary Rose, Ed Law, Andy French, Eli Shefter, Thelest Stewart, and Arvid Straube

Alison and Matthew outlined what would be involved with the development of a Master Plan prior to and in anticipation of a Phase 1 project that addresses the current situation in Bard Hall. Time: 4-6 months Expense: Platt-Whitelaw \$47,255; \$23,000; Total \$70,255. Possible alternatives, effect on the Pledge Drive, need for integration with the Strategic Plan, decision making process, and input that will be required from CRT were discussed.

*It was agreed unanimously to authorize Platt-Whitelaw/Southern Cross to proceed with the Master Plan.*

- Six subgroups will be interviewed:

Group	Organizer	Comments
Pre-school	Robin Bush	Robin will arrange preliminary meeting with Patty, Liz, John H., Becca Karpinski
Religious Education	Liz Jones	
Disabled Access	John Holl	Andy French would like to be included
Administration	Thelest S.	
Patio/Environmental	John Holl	
Ministerial Team Council	Arvid Straube	Most likely a special meeting

- CRT will identify key individuals that should be invited specifically. (please review attached Subgroup Key Individuals sheet and return with suggestions)
- John Holl will attend all the sessions and help with congregational input integration

The next CRT will be scheduled as the needs of the Alison and Matthew become evident. We will try to be flexible and respectful of Arvid's busy schedule.

Respectfully submitted,  
 John Holl, convener

First Unitarian Universalist Church of San Diego  
Campus Renovation Team  
Status Report, November 15, 2006

Thank you to all the CRT members in attendance at the joint meeting last evening. For those who could not be present, I would summarize the meeting as follows:

- An informative hour discussion with Larry Wheeler regarding the Financial Feasibility study and his thoughts about how we should proceed.
- Nearly unanimous approval of the following recommendation to be communicated to the Congregation-- **The Board, Generosity Ministry Team, Ministers, and Campus Renovation group enthusiastically recommend that the Congregation approve conducting a Capital Fund Drive in association with the Annual Pledge Drive to be held in the Spring of 2007.**
- Accepted the cover letter to accompany the FFS study. A smaller group of GMT will wordsmith this letter.
- Arrived at a working figure for the "base" or "phase 1" goal of \$2.6 million although may be raised pending outside grants.
- Listened to Matthew Boomhower outline what \$2.6 million might "buy" and requested that he break this package out into a form that would be easier to present to the forums.
- Deputized a group of the GMT to start working on the forums and education necessary prior to a December 10, 2006 Special Congregational Meeting.

As a metaphor for me to understand and explain the path of the CRT, I would offer the following: we are relay team running on two somewhat parallel tracts that occasionally converge. Some of us are on both teams at the same time.

- The first tract is the fund raising (development). CRT carried the baton through the FFS study and now is handing it off to the GMT under the able care of Iris Masoti which will ultimately delegate it to the Campaign committee under the lead of Dave Karpinski and Everett Howe with consultation from Larry Wheeler.
- The second tract is the fund disbursement (spending). To that end CRT is working with and supporting the work of Matthew, Alison, and Todd. Currently Kath Hillery is coordinating the input sessions with the architect and early in January we will be called to assess the findings of preliminary studies and inputs and to support in the design phase. In order not to fall behind in the time line, we must work under the assumption that the basic Bard Hall renovation is to proceed.

From now until December 10 the two tracts converge and we should be clear what is happening. GMT will be coordinating forums where the Congregation is discussing the Capital Fund goal and what might be or might not be included and CRT is holding meeting for input on Bard Hall. It is important that these actions work concurrently as they support each other. Acquiring input on Bard Hall strengthens our position with developing the Capital Fund Goal. Working on the Capital Fund goal assures that there will be money for the Bard Hall Project.

Matthew and the architects have been active in addressing preliminary reports which should soon be available and preparing for the input sessions. A new contract with the architects is being prepared so that they can continue seamlessly from the input stage to the design phase.

Upcoming meetings: I propose two meetings in the near future:

- Tuesday, November 21 any time in the afternoon when Kath Hillery can attend. This meeting should be to coordinate our support of the December 3 forums and any other meetings set up by the GMT and to support meetings coordinated by Kath in regard to Bard Hall.
- Tuesday, January 2 or Thursday, January 4 mid day. These meetings would be to review the findings of preliminary studies and the input sessions and to discuss how and what support is needed in the design phase. (I prefer January 4)

Please let me know if these will work for you.

Finally, thank you for all the support conducting the FFS interviews, both as interviewees and helpers.

John Holl, November 15, 2006