

Minutes of the meeting of the CICA Housing Committee, Tuesday January 11, 2011 at 7:15 in the Parish House

Present: Mabel Doughty, Bob Earnest, Beth Howe, Deb Hall, Ruth Slagle, John Wilson
Absent: Donna Damon

Next Meeting: Tuesday January 18, 2011 at 7:15 at the Parish House

Beth said that Donna had to go to the Historical Society Meeting but that she had sent an email with useful comments. Everyone had gotten it and agreed that in thinking about the specifics of the units, we go back to her ideas.

Beth suggested working through the tentative time-table to see how we are doing.

To 12/07 to

12/16/10 John Wilson reviews proposal from Keiser and KBS against each other (apples to apples). *Done and everyone has a copy of his analysis*

12/16 to

1/5/11 KBS, Keiser and John review their proposals against MSHA building and green standards. *Neither company has done this yet. We urged them to do it at our visit and John said he had asked again by email this morning.*

1/5/11 Draft of site plan from Jon Whitten, engineer. *He has provided a draft site plan. Beth said she thought that five parking spaces were required. (a check of the Zoning Ordinance indicates that 5 is correct). She said she thought that we had planned to have the building face more directly South (her reading of the map was in error, the back does face directly South.)*

Bob said that the length of the driveway is very close to the top limit for filling wet land without a permit – the driveway is 200 feet and the area that would need to be filled in 4000 square feet. Beth suggested ending the driveway/hammerhead and parking somewhat further back from the building to reduce the length. John said that that probably wouldn't make any difference since the area between the end of the driveway and the building would still need to be filled. Bob said that getting a Tier 1 permit from DEP is not a big deal. He will ask the soils person whether we would need to get this permit.

1/5/11 Septic system design. *Can't do this till we know the number of bedrooms. It will not take a lot of time.*

1/10/11 Final cost estimates from both building companies. *We are behind on this.*

1/14/11 CICA Affordable Housing Committee chooses which building to buy. *Committee will meet again on Tuesday January 18 and we may have enough information to make this decision then.*

1/19/11 Detailed drawings of foundation. *The builder of the building will provide specs for this. We need to have Whitten do the drawing.*

1/18/11 Final site plan from Whitten. *Might have this by then.*
1/20/11 Complete application to MSHA. *Bob thinks we don't have to submit the final application to MSHA before Town Meeting; in fact that they wouldn't approve it unless Town Meeting has approved.*

1/21/11 Review by CEO of site plan and septic design
1/22/11 AM Public Meeting on the proposal. This may still be realistic.
1/23/11 PM Public Meeting on the proposal

The Selectmen are supposed to set the time for Town Meeting at their Jan 12 meeting.

Beth asked John if we have spent any State money yet. He said no. Bob said there will probably be a bill from Whitten fairly soon.

There was some reporting by Beth, John and Bob who had gone to talk to the duplex sales people and tour the factories on January 10. Both companies are still in the running. Bob said it might be useful in urging them to look at the implications of the MSHA building and green standards, if we specify some of the things we might really be considering changing, like having a 10/12 pitch roof rather than 5/12 pitch, and a $\frac{3}{4}$ bath on the first floor and maybe only two bedrooms in one of the Keiser units since the bedrooms are small.

Beth said that it might help us to think through the changes we want to think about who might live in the building – a couple with two small children would use it differently than a family with older children or three adults. John said he thought that having three bedrooms in each unit would give us more flexibility. The smallness of the Keiser bedrooms may not be an issue – they are really just sleeping space. Bob said that it might be possible to get a moveable wall between the two small bedrooms. Deb said that many houses on Chebeague have small bedrooms and there are lots that don't have more than one bath. She said she thought we didn't have much information at this point in our year-round housing efforts to have a clear idea of who might live in the units. So we should not over-engineer them. Everyone else agreed with this.

Someone asked whether the floors would be carpeted. Bob said yes, and there would be linoleum in some areas. As with most Chebeague houses, the primary entry will be through the back into the kitchen, and that would have linoleum.

The discussion turned to the cost of the duplexes. Beth said we need to decide before Town Meeting which unit we want to buy so that we will have a firm estimate of the cost of the project. Deb said she wasn't sure this was necessary. She was concerned about having people at Town Meeting think that having the Town turn over a \$60,000 lot to CICA was a waste – it would be better to sell it. Bob said there would not be a market for it now, given the economy, and that there would probably be no takers at \$60,000. Deb said that we need to be able to tell people how much tax revenue the Town would be getting by having the development. Beth said we have a firm estimate of that. Bob said he thought it would not be a good idea to go to Town Meeting with two proposals. That made the Kids Place process much more difficult to explain and contentious.

John asked how the \$60,000 local contribution for land related to the \$175,000/unit (\$350,000 total grant from the State) and the 20 percent match. \$60,000 is not 20 percent of \$350,000, much less \$410,000. Beth looked up the calculation we had made in the MSHA application for permanent sources of funds. The land was valued at \$63,000; 20 percent of 350,000 would make the local match \$70,000. The total estimated project cost was \$424, 379 of which \$350,000 would be covered by the State grant, and \$63,000 by the value of the land, leaving \$11, 379 to be covered by fundraising by CICA.

Beth said she was willing to raise \$11,000, but not \$50,000, so we have to be careful about increasing costs of the duplexes because of the MSHA standards or our own changes. Deb and Mabel were strongly against having to raise any money on Chebeague, whether from the Town or from donations – it all comes out of people’s pockets. Support for the project would probably not be strong enough to overcome opposition to this. We should be able to say that we can do the project for the State’s \$350,000 plus the Town’s land contribution. Kids Place has left a bad taste in people’s mouths about having non-profits asking the Town (or its residents, individually) for money.

Bob said that there are several things in the project budget that we probably won’t actually spend -- \$20,000 for builder overhead and \$28,413 for contingencies. If we stuck to that, the real budget would come in at less than \$350,000 plus \$63,000. He said he thought that it is likely that we would be able to do the project without having to raise extra money. Beth worried about the starting higher cost of the KBS unit. Bob said that it partly because it is larger. John said that maybe that makes the smaller Keiser units more practical.

Bob said that there is also a good deal of uncertainty in the estimates we have been given by Keiser and KBS because of things like how much of the exterior finishing they do versus us. We need to get detailed cost quotes and then sift through them to be able to compare apples to apples the way John did with the first quotes. He said it may be worth rethinking the roof pitch, since that is only an aesthetic issue. The building is two stories, and recent houses built on the island that are two stories probably have lower pitched roofs than 10/12, and they look fine.

Beth said we need to get familiar with the MSHA standards so that the housing companies cannot persuade us that we need more expensive details by saying they are required by MSHA.

Bob said that, given MSHA’s concern about having storage space in the units, it might be worth getting a cost estimate on having a full basement. It might not be much more expensive than a crawl space – extra cost for concrete. Deb asked whether a slab on grade would be less expensive. Bob said it would not be because most slabs now also have to have frost walls. He said that manufactured housing companies do not generally build for a slab because they have to install floors in their houses to make them stand up to the transportation. Keiser can do this, but it is more expensive. Everyone agreed that it would be useful to get an estimate for a full basement as well as a crawl space.

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Howe