

Survey for New Church

Q. 1 Do you support beginning the design of plans for new church facilities? Yes: 185, 84%; No: 35, 16%; Total: 220, 100%

Q. 2 If yes, which would you prefer: Build on a new site? Yes: 106, 58%; No: 77, 42%; Total: 183, 100%

Q. 3 Or tear down and rebuild on the current site? Yes: 95, 56%; No: 75, 44%; Total: 170, 100%

ID#	Support?	New?	Current?	Comments
1	yes	yes		Benefits of new site: can expand, new opportunities, invite/welcome new people, better parking. Maybe current site because this church has been here for a long time. It is very family oriented so it holds a special place in all our hearts.
2	yes	yes	yes	New if land is available. Current ok, too. Either option for building is very acceptable. We do need to move forward with a plan. I would love to avoid underground parking but it is a good solution to the present location. I support either option. We need to go forward.
3	yes	yes	no	I actually wouldn't mind using our current site because of how close it is to WSU and as a student I walked here over the Newman Center. HOWEVER, parking is a main concern as well as a quick build timeline, so I would prefer a new site with ample parking available. Thanks!
4	yes	yes	yes	
5	yes	yes	no	Current site is the only option if land cannot be found within a reasonable distance of where parishioners live. Either way, keep the design simple and purposeful.
6	yes	yes	yes	<i>A question mark by 'new site'</i>
7	yes	yes		Current if nothing else happens with a new site. We need <u>our</u> church to grow and move to support <u>our</u> community better by outreaching more to serve it. If we do nothing, we will not have church buildings here for the next generation. Fixing the <u>flow</u> of the buildings will aid in building our sense of community. Teaching stewardship will be key on this endeavour.
8	yes			If tearing down is more expensive than funding a new site, I prefer to find a new site. It's also faster to build.
9	yes			Whichever works best for the church.
10	yes	yes	yes	Whatever is more affordable.
11	yes	yes	yes	<i>(Question marks by 'new' and 'current'.)</i>
12	yes	yes	yes	Current site if new site is unavailable.
13	yes	yes	yes	Current site if a new site is not available.
14	yes	yes	yes	<i>(Numbered 'New' as first choice.)</i> I think renovating is a valid option, and don't think we should too much more exploring it. Let's start fundraising!
15	yes	yes	yes	<i>(Numbered 'New' as first choice.)</i>
16	yes	yes	yes	New is first choice if there is a good site, otherwise rebuild.
17	yes	yes	yes	<i>(Numbered 'New' as first choice.)</i> We are OK with either option.
18	no	no	no	THIS IS ASKING FOR A BLANK CHECK. NEED TO KNOW COST!
19	no			I disagee with the assumption "we cannot leave things as they are". Making the existing structure safe and accessible seems reasonable. Anything beyond this, I will go to a different Catholic church.
20	no	no	no	I am old and may not see EITHER option happen but what would the cost of these options - per person OR household?? In dollar bills.
21	no	no	no	
22	no	no	no	We did not conclude all of paragraph two <i>(about deficiencies & high price tag)</i> . I helped renovate the Pullman high school it is now safe and accessible. You did not give the option to upgrade or renovate which I prefer.
23	no	no		
24	no			Can we keep Sanctuary and add on to the Church.
25	no	no	no	FIX WHAT WE HAVE!
26	no			
27	no			I've attended for 25+ years. Don't want to lose this great old building with its history.
28	no			

29	no			I am a visitor.
30	no			
31	no			
32	no	no	no	I support remodeling to make our facility welcoming and accessible to persons with limited mobility and those in wheel chairs. I am familiar with most of the other churches in our VBS consortium and many do not have advanced fire suppression systems, which does not seem essential as our children in classrooms are always supervised by two adults.
33	no	no	yes	
34	no			
35		yes		
36				Support if there is money. Doesn't really matter what I think. It is apparent the decision has been made.
37	no		yes	
38			no	Would it be possible to have two small parish churches in Pullman rather than one very large one?
39	yes	no	yes	
40	yes		yes	Add a Tabernacle
41	yes	no	yes	
42			yes	
43	no		yes	
44	yes		yes	
45	no	no	yes	
46	no	no	yes	
47			yes	
48	yes	no	yes	
49	yes	no	yes	
50	yes	no	yes	
51	yes		yes	I am not a member here, but I will be here for the whole summer. I enjoy the location, but I also do not know the cost for each option. Please do not take my vote into heavy consideration.
52	yes	no	yes	
53	yes	no	yes	
54	yes		yes	Although I prefer to build on current site, I realize that may not be feasible and am fine with a new site as well.
55	yes	no	yes	
56	yes	no	yes	
57	yes	no	yes	
58	yes	no	yes	
59	yes	no	yes	I like the central location of the current parish facilities. I think we can enrich/fulfill the mission to the campus community. This is particularly salient since an alternate site has yet to be identified. The search for a suitable property is open ended. It makes planning and its completion uncertain. As costly as creating underground parking is, it seems a more prudent option than seeking a new site. Perhaps, (a small likelihood, granted) adjacent property may become available, to help mitigate the expense of providing for parking.
60	yes	no	yes	
61	yes	no	yes	
62	yes	no	yes	
63	yes	no	yes	
64	yes	no	yes	
65	yes	no	yes	
66	yes	no	yes	
67	yes	no	yes	
68	yes	no	yes	

69	yes	no	yes	Church attendance is low, and projected attendance worldwide also suggests low attendance. I favor expansion of the common hall and office facilities and leaving our beautiful church alone.
70	yes	no	yes	
71	yes	no	yes	
72	yes	no	yes	
73	yes	no	yes	
74	yes	no	yes	
75	yes	no	yes	Depends on money, current site if cheaper
76	yes	no	yes	I am very interested in participating in this process as I have strong architectural and construction management background. <i>(Gave name & email address)</i>
77	yes		yes	
78	yes		yes	
79	yes		yes	
80	yes	no	yes	I love this church and the actual building. I hope it will continue to reside in its current location and w/in the college hill community.
81	yes		yes	
82	yes	no	yes	Members in my family stil have a few questions. One question we have is the need for more space. If our parish is shrinking in size, what is the need for more space? It seems that renovating our existing space is reasonable, especially considering all of the accessibility and other issues (safety, etc.) Thank you for this chance to give our feedback.
83	yes	no	yes	
84	yes	no	yes	I would love if the church maintained a resemblance to the design/architecture/style of the current church.
85	yes		yes	Rebuilding and building anew will, of course, be very expensive. However, a slightly perspective can have a more positive outcome: the need to build is <u>NOW</u> ; economically, the future will mean an increase in costs. The sooner action is taken, the better.
86	yes	no	yes	My preference would be to utilize the current land and address parking needs <u>unless</u> land is gifted to the church then moving to a new location is feasible.
87	yes	no	yes	
88	yes		yes	
89	yes	no	yes	
90	yes		yes	I feel keeping this church in the center of town is a good thing. Granted property on the outskirts of town may be available but unless the current site is too small or construction costs too high I would keep this location. Moving may be the only option if it saves consturction costs.
91	yes		yes	I think we have an excellct location. If new property that is available is too far from the center of town, I don't think we should pursue that. If it's costly either way, I think we should stick to our current location that is very accessible for a wide clientele. Thanks for asking!
92	yes	no	yes	
93	yes	no	yes	
94	yes		yes	
95	yes	no	yes	Bigger and convenient parking lot
96	yes	no	yes	
97	yes	no	yes	
98		no	yes	Only two alternatives here! If the problem is the electrical wiring, can that not be fixed without tearing down the whole structure? I am concerned that the costs here are prohibitive. Buying and building a new building is way out of line for the size of this congregation. I would like to see the costs for these option spelled out and made public.
99	yes	no	yes	I think we should build on this site in order to keep the church in the heart of Pullman. I think that will help make sure people still come to the church during the day for meetings, prayer, and Bible study, etc. It makes it easier to access the buses and collaborate with VBS. Also people less likely to leave after Sunday school

100	yes	no	yes	
101	yes	no	yes	
102	yes	no	yes	Yes to new site depending on land value.
103	yes	no	yes	
104	yes	yes	no	Parking is an issue
105	yes	yes	no	
106	yes	yes	no	
107	yes	yes	no	
108	yes	yes	no	
109	yes	yes	no	I love the current site. Unfortunately I feel it would be more cost effective and less disruptive to move to a new site.
110	yes	yes	no	
111	yes	yes	no	
112	yes	yes	no	
113	yes	yes	no	
114	yes	yes	no	
115	yes	yes	no	
116	yes	yes	no	
117	yes	yes	no	
118	yes	yes	no	
119	yes	yes	no	
120	yes	yes	no	
121	yes	yes		Perhaps could rebuild on the current site? We believe it is time to take these steps and will contribute accordingly.
122	yes	yes	no	
123	yes	yes	no	Can we try to bring pews/artifacts from our current church to prevent the new one from being too "modernized"? It would be so special.
124	yes	yes	no	
125	yes	yes	no	
126	yes	yes	no	
127	yes	yes	no	Need a number, a dollar goal. Then a <u>major</u> fund raising plan.
128	yes	yes	no	
129	yes	yes	no	
130	yes	yes	no	
131	yes	yes	no	
132	yes	yes	no	Rebuilding doesn't help with parking :)
133	yes	yes	no	The property value of the current church is almost certainly higher than elsewhere in town: better financial decision to sell. We will need somewhere to celebrate mass while the new church is built - not sure if Thomas More is sufficient. It would better ensure the continuity of our community. Selling provides the opportunity for future growth and partnerships with Catholic Charities that can't be accommodated in the current space.
134	yes	yes	no	
135	yes	yes	no	I support strongly the building of a new church if land can be acquired. I believe one would need to see how funds could be raised to do this first. e.g. <u>pledges</u> .
136	yes	yes	no	As with the Stone Church down the block, the building left for dwellings ought to be chosen. Remodeling for us to stay is way costly. Undoing to redo, and then still having inadequate parking or growing space leaves us hanging where we are now - w/o adequate growing space. The parking lot is prime real estate, as is where the parish house is. Remove it and the double lot is another prime space. So, we require space to grow in/on. Let us find a space to build new on. Peacefulnesses.

137	yes	yes	no	Building a new church off-site would be preferable to rebuilding on current site, however if it is significantly less expensive to rebuild on the existing site, we would support that decision.
138	yes	yes	no	
139	yes	yes	no	
140	yes	yes	no	
141	yes	yes	no	
142	yes	yes	no	
143	yes	yes	no	
144	yes	yes	no	I do not believe we can properly address the parking issues at our current site.
145	yes	yes	no	
146	yes	yes		
147	yes	yes		
148	yes	yes		
149	yes	yes		
150	yes	yes		All depends on what \$ the parish is willing to pledge an amount we have to work with. (Can't have a loan and no one willing to pay).
151	yes	yes		
152	yes	yes		
153	yes	yes		
154	yes	yes		
155	yes	yes		Thank you for this survey and keeping the process moving forward. Although I believe building on a new site is the better option, if a suitable new site is not available - then building on the current site is an option. Starting the planning process is an important step and needs to begin very soon. Thank you
156	yes	yes		If we build on a new site, I would like to have some of the beautiful things here in the current church reflected in the new one. Many of the newer, ultra modern new churches lack the warmth of the old ones.
157	yes	yes		This is fantastic. How can I help. (Name included - forwarded to committee).
158		yes		
159	yes	yes		
160	yes	yes		
161	yes	yes		
162	yes	yes		
163		yes		
164		yes		
165	yes	yes		
166	yes	yes		
167	yes	yes		
168	yes	yes		
169	yes	yes		Is this an <u>option</u> ? (<i>regarding building on a new site</i>) . Going forward is my option/opinion! My first option is to build at a new location. If that is not an option to rebuild
170	yes	yes	no	If there is a good site otherwise, no. (<i>regarding building on a new site</i>) Unless there is no good site for a new site. (<i>regarding rebuilding</i>)
171	no			I think the current building needs restoration.
172	no	no	no	Perfectly fine with the current site :)
173	no			
174	no			
175	yes	no		Partial - Not the church (<i>regarding rebuilding</i>) Support building for classes in separate structure - Bring church up to code. Try to acquire property near church for more parking if needed.

176	yes			NEED MORE INFO
177	yes	no	no	
178	no			Not until the membership is given the facts and an open discussion meeting is held. You are dividing the parish!!
179	no			
180	no	no	no	
181	no			
182	no			I am still not convinced that we couldn't correct, repair, and renovate the existing church to make it fully safe and accessible.
183	no			
184				Remodel. Spend for more parking lots.
185	yes			? By 'building on a new site'
186	yes	yes	no	Not my first choice (<i>regarding rebuilding</i>), but better than today's situation. Please keep as many trees as possible, if the block is razed. Thank you for your time! <i>Letter and sketch of possible church & classrooms attached. Parishioner suggests partnering with SEL and building a 'box' building near the top of the hill on the SEL campus.</i>
187	yes	no	yes	Try to avoid tearing down the church. I will go along with whatever the majority of parishioners want, providing donations are sufficient.
188	yes	yes		
189	yes		yes	1. Is the present facility too far gone to not need major overhaul? If the church needs major repairs, can they be done? Is it feasible? I like the present church, but I understand that things may be needed that are not known by most of us. For example, the sidewalk at the rear of the church is being undermined as the earth & concrete no longer meet. If the church can be maintained like it is then that is my preferred option. 2. I really feel a bit unsure of how to answer these questions because I don't know the results of feasibility studies or cost estimates. I can only say what my heart says and that's maybe what you want.
190	yes	no	no	We can build on the property between church & rectory. Tear down rectory & build classrooms & rectory in one building. Where old rectory house is could be a parking lot. OR dig down by classrooms to create ground level entrance. OR have a "traffic patrol" in the existing parking lot. <i>Name given</i>
191	no			
192				1) I believe working on our current site is the right thing to do. Remodeling, expanding, tearing down parish house, parts of the building and redoing is best. 2) Keep the church as Europeans do :) They have all what is needed for spiritual growth. Build a newer area for our children that is safer. 3) Fix what needs to be fixed. No need to spend millions of dollars we do not have. Thanks for the work you have put into this.
193	yes	yes	no	
194	yes	yes	no	Would love to stay on current site, but if parking can be expanded! This depends on purchase of lot next door? If that can be done and church expanded enough to accommodate future growth, it would be great to stay at this central location! Would the current site be big enough to accomodate this?
195	yes		yes	If white house can be purchased.
196			yes	Estimates needed on both options. Spend the \$ needed to give cost of tearing down existing church and house and building new church large enough to include functions in house as well. I doubt if congregation will give much. Must pay architect to give rough estimate of both options.
197	yes	no	yes	
198	yes	no	yes	Proceed with design plan first, which would include acquisition of end lot next to parish office. In other words utilize the property we have, rather than continue speculating on the purchase of property outside of Pullman.
199	yes	no	yes	Whichever decision is made, the fundraising needs to begin now. There is no viable solution that is cost-free.
200	yes	yes		Whatever is most economical.
201	yes		yes	It was always lunacy to consider building anew on the outskirts of a suburb. Since this is no longer a possibility, we should do the best we can with the beautiful space we have in the center of this town.
202	yes	yes	no	No

203	no			I confess to having voted in the same way on the paper ballot at 8:30 mass on June 17. But since I suspect "No" votes to begin the design of plans for new church facilities will be in the distinct minority, given the way the ballot preface is worded, which essentially eliminates the repair, renovate, and correct option, I feel compelled to expand on my reasons for voting "No" on that paper ballot. Given the lack of almost any corroborating evidence (but for one estimate of \$10,000 to fix a light problem in the sanctuary) that the repair, renovate, and correct option would be too expensive to pursue--only vaguely projected to be ~\$8 million, I see it as incumbent on us to get firmer, more secure estimates of the cost of this option before we dismiss it as impossible. If I remember the proceedings of the meeting on June tenth correctly, Fr. Steve Dublinski could (and would?) pursue the services of engineering firms outside of Pullman (since it appears no local firms are available or willing) to analyze the needs and costs of electrical, plumbing, emergency egress, and ADA access alterations. Maybe with a firmer idea of what this option would cost, in comparison to what we already know or think would be very high prices for building new off site or rebuilding extensively on site, we can make a more considered and productive decision of how to proceed. I, for one, and for reasons I've already expressed in other places and opportunities, would be much more willing to donate money over a sustained period of time, if necessary, to preserving the present church rather than trying to rebuild completely on site or completely build anew, somewhere off site, thus abandoning Sacred Heart's 100+ years benign presence on the College Hill community.
204	yes	no	yes	Start ASAP
205	no	yes	no	Please don't tear down the beautiful church :(
206	yes	yes	no	I think this would take a mighty fundraising effort but I truly believe it could spur more growth and participation in the parish.
207	yes	no	yes	My only concern would be expanding parking somehow.
208	yes	yes	no	Before starting any design, I think that cornerstone donors must be identified. Without cornerstone donors, spending money on design is a waste.
209	yes	yes	no	
210	yes	yes	no	
211	yes	yes	no	Is there any way to keep the current church for small events, daily Mass, a community presence on College Hill? I KNOW we need a new one and it cant be in the same location - but how can Catholic Charities or the Diocese of Spokane utilize what it already owns?
212	no			I do not think it is necessary to build a new church. It will cost far too much and will be a financial burden.
213	yes	yes	no	NA
214	yes	yes		
215	yes	yes		
216	yes	no	yes	As a staff member I live almost daily with the current facilities. We need to remodel onsite at the very least in order to grow as a Parish!
217	yes	no	yes	With all the other deficiencies, please make sure there will be effective handicap access and adequate parking.
218	yes	yes	yes	I would like it large enough to grow and accessible parking. I know a fair number of families, albeit maybe less committed than they could be, that attempt to come to mass, can't find parking and drive home. It's essential to capture these and other families to continue to grow as a parish.
219	yes	no	yes	
220	yes	no	yes	It would be really sad to see the church torn down, if rebuilt in a new place please make sure that it is not used for any secular/sacreligious use.
221	yes	yes	no	This church is wonderful and I have fond memories of baptizing our kids here but I think The fiscally responsible thing would be to build elsewhere. But I hope whatever is built is done so with input from the community. Could it include a multipurpose building? Potentially for rental to help raise funds.
222	yes	no	no	update the present. tear down the old house . add small office/etc bldng on. buy corner house for parking
223	yes	no	yes	
224	yes	no	no	I like the church the way it is
225	yes	yes	no	

226	yes	yes	no	I support whatever decision is ultimately made. I am hopeful that if we build at a different location the University would want to purchase our existing facility.
227	yes	yes	no	
228	yes	no	yes	I really didn't know how to answer the first question in this survey, but I read the reports provided. After reading all the data provided, it does feel like a new building is needed. If at all possible, I would prefer that it remain at the current location. The whole block would be needed. Could the current parking lot be used as well, possibly for the two story parking structure. I have heard an analysis that after the twelfth row of pews, you have another church. Could the new church be wider than long with pie like sections of pews, possibly four or more isles. Churches I have attended that have that "circular type" of arrangement have felt more connected. It is obvious that a lot of work has been done, by many people. I may have missed it. What would be the cost of this new facility.
229	yes	yes	no	Need to move to a new site that will allow flexibility to meet needs of parish.
230	yes	yes		Present land for buildings and parking too small. Need to move to allow for growth and more community involvement.
231	yes	yes	no	
232	yes	no	no	I support fixing up the existing church- making it up to fire code, etc. I also support building or expanding on to the existing social hall. So the first question is a bit ambiguous, which is why I put in the comments. I do not support building a new church, either on site or at another site. But I do support putting money into getting the church up to code and building existing office space, classrooms, etc. But the church is a historical resource, and we have not had standing room only at any masses that I have been for the last twenty years. So the message should not be- we need these facilities because of huge growth taking place. But we want good facilities for the existing and future community, even if it is not much larger than what we have. Of course the question is how to support it, another big question