

Outline to Facilitate Values Conversation of March 18, 2008

I. Values Process – transparent, accountable, maximum participation

1. Identify our shared values
2. Consider their comparative importances
3. Establish thresholds/ranges (e.g. not in Creswell)
- 4. The Crux – tradeoffs and links between values**

II. Through a shared conversation about our values to a shared decision

1. history of research and decisions to date –
see <http://www.uueugene.org/building-proj/Progress.html>
and <http://www.uueugene.org/building-proj/Q&A.html>
2. Discuss values when applied to three representative but not specific scenarios

III. The Values for a Growing Spiritual and Ethical Community

Tier 1.

Location
Availability (time frame)
Suitability (size, shape, flexibility, playground...)
Economics / Affordability (land, building, construction or remodeling, maintenance)

Tier 2.

Social justice (opportunities for on/off site, impact and fit for neighborhood, accessibility)
Environment (site-type, greenfield or built, infrastructure, transportation,
VMT (vehicle miles traveled), transit options, construction/reconstruction)
Security
Aesthetics (inside/outside, relationship to nature)
Visibility (prominence, landmarks, signage, distinction)

Three Reality-based Possibilities

A. WEST EUGENE SCENARIO – land only

Neighborhood – residential or industrial, a future growth area
Availability – ready for purchase now, several year's delay possible to deal with annexation and access issues
Suitability – we could develop the land and construct buildings to our specifications within cost constraints
Economics - \$3-\$4 million, building additional, major infrastructure needs are likely, overall cost may be highest
Social justice – opportunities offsite
Safety – similar to current
Environmental – greenfield, woodland, wetland, we develop parking.
Construction - we can be as green as we can afford to be
Transportation – VMT likely more than current, bus is better than current, Bike/Walk is flatter but farther
Aesthetics – natural beauty, near busy road
Visibility – greater than or equal to current

B. CENTRAL EUGENE SCENARIO - Building and land

Neighborhood – mixed residential and commercial, UUCE seems a good fit

Availability – can be purchased now, several years to move-in

Suitability – sufficient with some modifications and compromises (e.g., layout adaptation, no adjacent outdoor playground)

Economics - \$3-\$4 million for land and building, renovations likely additional, overall cost may be lowest

Social Justice – opportunities on and offsite, accessibility issues a priority for renovation

Safety/Security – urban issues

Environmental – urban area, parking includes streets

Construction – renovation of existing building may be greenest but energy/maintenance could be substantial

Transportation

Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) central location

Bus – as good as it gets

Bike/Walk – excellent opportunities

Aesthetics – very good inside, mediocre outside. Minimal links to nature

Visibility – more than current

C. SOUTH EUGENE SCENARIO – land only

Neighborhood – residential, UUCE seems a good fit

Availability – some sooner, some later, access, annexation, infrastructure – these may apply

Suitability – we could develop the land and construct buildings to our specifications within cost constraints. We may need to partner with developer.

Economics - \$3-\$4 million may include some of the new building. Depends on infrastructure development needs. Overall, seems to be middle range.

Social Justice – opportunities offsite

Safety/Security – similar to present site

Environmental – likely greenfield, forest or wetlands, we develop parking

Transportation

Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) greater than or equal to current

Bus – less than or equal to current

Bike/Walk – less than or equal to (hills, distance)

Aesthetics – ranges from pristine natural to natural mix with utility corridor

Visibility – less than or equal to current