

## Table of Contents

I.	Acknowledgements .....	2
II.	History.....	3
III.	Committee Charge.....	5
IV.	Executive Summary.....	6
V.	Research - Committee Charge #1.....	10
VI.	Planning - Committee Charge #2.....	12
VII.	Fundraising - Committee Charge #3.....	13
VIII.	Use and Ownership - Committee Charge #4.....	15
IX.	Recommendations – Overall Work Projects.....	16
X.	Estimates.....	18
XI.	Photographs.....	19

## List of Appendices

Appendix A	<i>National Register of Historic Places – Inventory - Nomination Form February 20, 1970</i>
Appendix B	<i>Spurwink Church Restoration Work November 13, 2003 Pinkham &amp; Greer Consulting Engineers, Inc.</i>
Appendix C	<i>Comments from Kirk F. Mohney, Assistant Director of the Maine Historic Preservation Commission July 2005</i>
Appendix D	<i>Spurwink Congregational Church (1802) Cape Elizabeth Visited 15 August 2005 Greater Portland Landmarks Advisory Service</i>
Appendix E	<i>Relative Floor Elevations September 15, 2005 Pinkham &amp; Greer Consulting Engineers, Inc.</i>
Appendix F	<i>Spurwink Church Restoration Work November 21, 2005 Pinkham &amp; Greer Consulting Engineers, Inc.</i>
Appendix G	<i>Spurwink Church Structure December 19, 2005 Pinkham &amp; Greer Consulting Engineers, Inc.</i>
Appendix H	<i>SPUR Spurwink Notes Work Description and Priorities March 2006 John Leeke, Preservation Consultant</i>
Appendix I	<i>SPUR Spurwink Notes Work Description and Priorities 4/11/2006 update: exterior paint and window assessment, costings John Leeke, Preservation Consultant</i>
Appendix J	<i>Spurwink Church Opinion of Probable Construction Costs April 27, 2006 Pinkham &amp; Greer Consulting Engineers, Inc.</i>
Appendix K	<i>Comments from Earle G. Shettleworth, Jr., Director of the Maine Historic Preservation Commission May 1, 2006</i>
Appendix L	<i>Statistical Information – Use of the Spurwink Church Policy - Provisions for Use of the Spurwink Church January 9, 2006 Rental Forms</i>
Appendix M	<i>Practical Restoration Reports Compendium 10/15/2005- Excerpts John Leeke, Preservation Consultant (Copied as reference by permission.)</i>
Appendix N	<i>Publicity – Articles and News Written About The Project</i>

## Acknowledgements

### **Spurwink Church Study Committee**      Appointed April 11, 2004

Jane B. Beckwith	13 Oakwood Road
Daniel S. Chase	26 Stonybrook Road
Carolyn M. Fritz, Town Council	1 Stirrup Road
Paul J. McKenney, Town Council	5 Katahdin Road
Darren B. McLellan, Co-Chairman	35 Alewife Cove Road
R. Bruce Munger, Co-Chairman	175 Two Lights Road
Elizabeth B. Peterson	231 Fowler Road
Ann R. Strout	40 Zeb's Cove Road
Millicent Vetterlien*	29 Westminster Terrace

*\*Ms. Vetterlien moved from Cape Elizabeth in the fall of 2005.*

Debra M. Lane, Ex-officio	Assistant Town Manager
Ernest W. MacVane, Jr., Ex-officio	Facilities Manager

Michael K. McGovern, Town Manager  
E. Janet Hannigan, Church Greeter

### **Engineers**

David K. Pinkham, P.E.	Pinkham & Greer Consulting Engineers
Brian E. Duffy, AIA	Brian E. Duffy Associates

### **Consultants**

John Leeke, Preservation Consultant  
Maine Historic Preservation Commission  
Greater Portland Landmarks Advisory Service

### **Committee Meeting Schedule**

June 6, 2005  
July 18, 2005  
August 15, 2005  
September 19, 2005  
October 17, 2005  
November 21, 2005  
December 19, 2005  
January 18, 2006  
February 15, 2006  
March 15, 2006  
April 12, 2006  
May 8, 2006  
May 24, 2006

## History of the Spurwink Church Building

Religious services for all of the area of Cape Elizabeth were first provided in the original meetinghouse on Meetinghouse Hill. This was in the extreme north part of town. In 1801 the decision was made that the south part of town, so called Spurwink, should have its own meetinghouse, but remain part of the north congregation. Land for a building and cemetery was donated by Jonathan Mitchell.

The building for Spurwink, the so-called South Meetinghouse, was first constructed in 1802. Like the now North Meetinghouse, it was a typical meetinghouse, with no entryway, tower, or steeple, but with a porch on the south side. Four large wooden pillars supported the ceiling. A temporary pulpit was built on the north side. The seating was of planking. There was no provision for heating other than foot stoves.

(It is not clear which sides of the building are meant by “north” and “south”. Judging by the weather vane, the four corners of the building correspond to the four compass points. In old meeting houses the speakers were often located on the long side of the meeting space, rather than at the end. If the speaker were located on the long “north” side, toward the marsh, this would jive with having the other long side be “south”, and letting in sun and warmth. With regard to the building as it stands today, this becomes a moot point below.)

In 1804, the pulpit was rebuilt with winding stairs, and pews were constructed.

In 1834, the meetinghouse was stripped down until only the frame and foundation remained, including removing the four large wooden pillars. The original windows, front porch, and other salvageable items were sold to raise funds. The building was rebuilt in its current configuration, including the entryway, belfry, and weather vane, and was given its first coat of white paint. It is a mixture of Federal, Greek Revival, and Gothic architectural styles, as was common in the 1830's.

It is interesting to note that the original North Meetinghouse was also taken down and rebuilt in 1834. After this time, the buildings are referred to as North Church and South Church, rather than meetinghouses. Illustrations show the North Church to have been quite similar in appearance to the South Church. Stoves, taken from the North, were installed in the South. Presumably, a chimney for the stoves had to be added at this time, but no specific mention was found.

In November 1895, the original chandelier fell and broke into pieces (almost setting the church on fire). The present chandelier was purchased second hand and installed to replace the original. It was probably originally cast around 1850. It burned kerosene until electrified in 1982.

In 1896 a committee was appointed by the North Church to survey the South Church for much needed repairs. The building was placed on a new foundation and a cellar was dug. A furnace was installed in the cellar. Presumably, the current chimney on the end of the building was added, and the old stove chimney removed, when the furnace was installed, but no specific mention was found. Remnants of the old stove chimney were found in the attic a few years ago when the roof was resurfaced.

In 1921, new carpeting was laid.

The pump organ dates from 1890. It was donated to the church by a Miss Ida Brown in 1922.

In 1935, the South Church became independent from the North Church. Presumably, the church became more widely identified as the Spurwink Church after this time.

In 1957, the church disbanded and the property was transferred to the Town.

In 1958, the front doors were replaced.

On February 20, 1970, an application was filed to list the church on the National Register of Historical Places.

Although the church had a belfry and steeple after 1834, it never had a bell. In 1970, the belfry and steeple were rebuilt as exact replicas of the originals and, in September, the old fire bell from the Cape Elizabeth Town Hall was installed.

In 1973, gold leaf was applied to the weather vane.

Submitted by Dan Chase  
Research from CE Historical Society files  
A History of the S.P. Congregational Church, by Rosella Loveitt  
Additional research from Jane Beckwith

<b>Committee Charge</b>
-------------------------

**Spurwink Church Study Committee**

**Approved by the Town Council February 14, 2005**

**Committee Purpose**

The Spurwink Church is the oldest public building in Cape Elizabeth and is on the National Register of Historic Places. First built in 1802, it was substantially renovated in 1834 and was renovated in 1895. A number of improvements were made in 1982 with publicly donated funds. The church may be in need of more preservation work and citizen input is needed to determine the work that should be done, how the work should be paid for and the town's future role relating to the church. The committee is specifically charged with the following assignment:

- Review all relevant material and seek advice from consultants, including those knowledgeable with historic preservation relating to the condition of the Spurwink Church.
- Develop a plan for any proposed rehabilitation of the structure and for any site changes.
- Make a recommendation to the Town Council on how any plan developed should be funded.
- Review and make a recommendation on the town's position on ownership and responsibility for the church.

**Committee Structure**

The Spurwink Church Study Committee shall consist of nine persons. The town council, following a recommendation from the appointments committee, shall appoint seven citizens. Two members of the committee shall be members of the town council at the time of their appointment. The committee shall appoint its' own chair and secretary. The facilities manager and the assistant town manager shall serve as non-voting ex-officio members.

**Committee Resources**

The committee may expend up to \$12,000 from the Spurwink Church fund for professional advice/engineering services.

## **Executive Summary**

The Spurwink Church is the oldest public building in Cape Elizabeth and is on the National Register of Historic Places (See Appendix A). First built in 1802, it was substantially renovated in 1834 and was renovated in 1895. In 1957 the church was disbanded and the church and property transferred to the Town of Cape Elizabeth. A number of improvements were made in 1982 with publicly donated funds.

In late 2003, the Town hired Pinkham & Greer Consulting Engineers, Inc. to conduct a general evaluation of the Spurwink Church (See Appendix B). The evaluation included entry doors and frames, plaster ceiling in the chapel, whether or not there is a need for insulation, foundation and structure, painting and general overview. The evaluation revealed work would need to be done beyond the annual maintenance program.

On February 14, 2005 the Cape Elizabeth Town Council approved the recommendation of Town Manager Michael K. McGovern to establish a Spurwink Church Study Committee to review the needs of the church and the Town's role in meeting the needs. (See page 5)

Following nearly a year of further evaluation, discussion, consulting with engineers and historic experts, the Spurwink Church Study Committee is pleased to present its' Final Report to the Cape Elizabeth Town Council.

The committee's focus is to maintain the structural integrity of the church, the historical significance and the desire to conserve the charm and character that has evolved for over 200 years. The committee considered the importance to the community as owners/custodians of the building. Architecture, practical importance, visual character of the history and history are all factors in the recommendations.

Early on, the committee learned from the advisors that the least disruption to the building is best. Preservation Consultant John Leeke summed it best when he was quoted, "Less Is More." Thomas L. Hinkle, Greater Portland Landmarks Advisory Service cautioned the committee "to avoid excessive or unnecessary disturbance of the existing structure. As a general rule, conservation of an important historic structure such as the Spurwink Church should be carried out with the absolute minimum loss of old material. That does not mean only "original" material, but that which has been added in later remodelings. These changes form essential parts of the church." (See Appendix D)

John Leeke, Maine Historic Preservation Commission and the Greater Portland Landmarks Advisory Service provided valuable input during this

process. John Leeke was hired to assist with the priority order of work and the cost estimates (See Appendices H & I). Mr. Leeke taught the committee that preservation, restoration, rehabilitation and maintenance could all occur during this project, while still respecting the historical importance of the church.

Foundation, stabilization, and related drainage, were identified as the top priorities. The committee recommends a full frost wall around the exterior perimeter, while maintaining the current façade with mortar and rubble stone. The foundation itself can be of a different material.

Drainage improvements are needed to direct water away from the structure to avoid further deterioration of the sill, particularly on the Route 77 side. The Greater Portland Landmarks Advisory Service concurs, "Having the base of the wooden structure in contact with the ground introduces moisture into all the components of the structure including the sills of the frame, causing decay and failure." Removal of snow away from the building will further assist in the build up of moisture against the building.

Reports indicate that the building needs to be leveled. The committee recommends the church not be permanently raised, more than necessary to meet proper drainage requirements. However temporary jacking of the building will be necessary to perform the related work. Raising the structure increases the possibility of damage, particularly to the interior plaster walls and ceiling. Experts recommend projects relating to the interior paint, plaster ceiling and walls, and floors wait 2 years after the foundation work for settling.

The vestibule lacks a foundation and is in need of stabilization. Repair to the ceiling, following water damage is needed.

Second to the foundation and stabilization is the visual character. Much discussion centered on the clapboards and painting of the exterior. The recommendation is to repair, spot scrape and paint. Remove existing paint to bare wood, where necessary. "Preservation In Place," a phrase used Mr. Leeke is the best practice to minimize the removal or moving of the clapboards. Repairs may be done as necessary, whether using authentic or reproduction clapboards. The primary façade is the front and Route 77 sides. Although the primary façade needs the most work, all sides will be addressed.

The committee recommends the removal of the chimney. From a historical point of view, the chimney may or may not stand, as it was not part of the original structure. The chimney is in poor repair and would have been taken down and replaced. A new, more efficient, power vent

system is being recommended, therefore eliminating the need for the chimney. Finally, aesthetically the committee prefers the chimney removed.

Insulation was another important, and potentially costly, consideration. It is not recommended to add insulation to the outside walls. The building was built to carry out the air. Because moisture change is harmful to the plaster walls and ceiling, the facility should be kept at a constant humidity. Upon installation of the power vent system, replacing the heating system thermostat with a humidistat should be considered to accomplish this. This should also allow heating the building to lower temperatures than it is now, and saving on fuel costs.

Replacement of the front doors to an historic appropriate period is recommended. Screen doors were an addition in later years for practical use. Additional research is needed to determine the appropriate style door (s) and materials.

Funds are included in the cost estimate for a written and pictorial account of the project. The committee found when trying to research projects to this point, it was difficult to determine when changes were made over the years.

The cost of an archaeologist monitor for excavation is not included. If the project reveals any findings, there should be appropriate funds within the project to investigate.

It is difficult to anticipate the totality of this project until further review is completed. Estimates are included for additional investigation before bid packages are prepared (see page 18). This step was not taken at this time, as it is premature at this stage.

Actual costs of the project will depend on what further investigation reveals relating to the foundation and stabilization, and any damage to the plaster walls and coved plaster ceiling. Discussions with John Leeke suggest that a contingency of 40%-60% should be factored into the exterior (Phase 2) and interior (Phase 3) estimates (not including the foundation and stabilization). The committee has decided to recommend 50%.

The project has been divided into three phases for a total estimate of \$485,500. This estimate includes \$50,900 contingency for Phases 2 & 3 and \$225,000 for an endowment fund. It is recommended that bid documents not be released until the funds are available. If it is decided to build by phase, as funds are available, contingencies should be made if funds aren't available for all phases.

The committee's goal is that this project will satisfy the capital needs of the church. The foundation and stabilization is a project expecting to last 100 years. Ultimately the committee recommends an endowment fund, building over many years, for the ongoing maintenance. Ongoing maintenance includes a roof (20 years), interior and exterior painting (10-15 years) and heating system and ductwork (15-20 years).

The committee strongly suggests that the town use best management practices, the advice of historic consultants, and tradesmen versed in historic conservation and preservation as they move forward with this project. Some projects may require the expertise and techniques of an experienced tradesman. Careful and deliberate steps must be taken to ensure that the work is done appropriately and with respect to the facility.

Depending on the funding sources, formal review may be required by the Maine Historic Preservation Commission or other state/federal agencies.

From the initial \$12,000 provided to the committee, \$8876.82 has been expended for engineering and consultant costs. Funds will also be spent for the production of the final report. The remainder of the funds could be provided to the fund raising committee to begin that process.

The Spurwink Church Study Committee wishes to thank everyone who participated in this process. The committee extends special thanks to David Pinkham and John Leeke for their guidance and expertise.

A landmark in our community, the Spurwink Church is a valuable piece of our history and our future. The members of the committee are honored to have served.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Spurwink Church Study Committee

## Research - Committee Charge #1

- Review all relevant material and seek advice from consultants, including those knowledgeable with historic preservation relating to the condition of the Spurwink Church.

The committee began its' discussion based on the November 13, 2003 report from Pinkham & Greer Consulting Engineers, Inc. - *Spurwink Church Restoration Work* (See Appendix B).

July 2005 – Contacts were made with the Maine Preservation Society, Greater Portland Landmarks, Maine Historic Preservation Committee and Janet Hannigan, Church Greeter.

July 2005 – See comments provided by Kirk F. Mohny, Assistant Director of the Maine Historic Preservation Commission regarding the November 13, 2003 Pinkham & Greer report *Spurwink Church Restoration Work* (See Appendix C).

August 15, 2005 - A committee site visit was held at the Spurwink Church in conjunction with the Greater Portland Landmarks Advisory Service tour. Following the tour, a written report was provided to the committee. *Spurwink Congregational Church (1802) Cape Elizabeth Visited 15 August 2005* (See Appendix D).

September 2005 - *Relative Floor Elevations September 15, 2005*  
Pinkham & Greer prepared relative floor elevations of the main portion of the church and the vestibule. This report was to supplement the initial engineer's report to determine deviation and differential settling of the walls and floor (See Appendix E).

November 2005 – As the committee continued to deliberate the priorities for the scope of work, they asked Pinkham & Greer to provide additional information on rehabilitation of the vestibule, review of the steeple, and exterior and interior conservation as these aspects relate to the structural integrity of the building. *Spurwink Church Restoration Work November 21, 2005* (See Appendix F) and *Spurwink Church Structure December 19, 2005* (See Appendix G).

February 2006 – In an effort to provide additional professional assistance from an historical view, Pinkham & Greer contacted the Maine Historic Preservation Commission. John Leeke was on the list of resources from the Commission. Mr. Leeke was contracted to assist the committee.

March 2006 – Based on the committee’s priorities, Mr. Leeke prepared in detail the scope of work and listed the work projects in order of priority. *SPUR Spurwink Notes Work Description and Priorities* (See Appendix H).

April 2006 - Mr. Leeke provided preliminary costs to the priority list. *SPUR Spurwink Notes Work Description and Priorities 4/11/06 update: exterior paint and window assessment, costings* (See Appendix I). Cost estimates for the scope of project were prepared by Pinkham & Greer *Spurwink Church Opinion of Probable Construction Costs April 27, 2006* (See Appendix J).

May 1, 2006 – See comments from Earle G. Shettleworth, Jr., Director of the Maine Historic Preservation Commission (See Appendix K) regarding the John Leeke report *SPUR Spurwink Notes Work Description and Priorities*.

For a history of the building see *History of the Spurwink Church Building* - Submitted by Dan Chase. Research from Cape Elizabeth Historical Society files. *A History of the South Portland Congregational Church* by Rosella Loveitt. Additional research by Jane Beckwith.

## Planning - Committee Charge #2

- Develop a plan for any proposed rehabilitation of the structure and for any site changes.

During the course of the committee's work, the following work projects were identified and discussed at length.

1. Foundation stabilization
2. Drainage – direct drainage way from the structure
3. Rehabilitate the Vestibule – shore up or reconstruct
4. Steeple – Structural and visual
5. Exterior - finish carpentry and chimney
6. Interior – rehabilitation as needed

### Exterior Priorities

- Siding
- Gutters
- Chimney
- Insulation
- Furnace
- Windows

### Inside Priorities

- Furnace
- Windows
- Plaster
- Carpet
- Front Doors

Please refer to the following segments of the report, which provide the recommended work projects in detail.

Recommendations – Work Projects                      Page 16

Estimates    Page 18

*SPUR Spurwink Church Notes Work Description and Priorities 4/11/2006*  
John Leeke Preservation Consultant                      Appendix I

*Spurwink Church Opinion of Probable Construction Costs April 27, 2006*  
Pinkham & Greer Consulting Engineers                      Appendix J

### **Fundraising - Committee Charge #3**

- Make a recommendation to the Town Council on how any plan developed should be funded.

#### **Recommendations – Funding**

- ❖ Appoint a fund raising committee – See suggested tasks and ideas.
- ❖ It may be worthwhile to consider hiring a grant writer if a resident volunteer is unavailable to serve.
- ❖ Bids should not be solicited until funds are available. The time line, see below, is tentative. Bids will not be solicited until the town has sufficient resources to complete the project. The committee recommends work should be undertaken in phases, as financing is available.

A 12-member committee is recommended, with the following expertise, as follows:

- ❖ Grant writing experience
- ❖ Fund raising experience
- ❖ Marketing
- ❖ Public Relations
- ❖ (2) Members of the Spurwink Church Study Committee
- ❖ (2) Town Council

#### **Fund Raising Committee Tasks**

- Market – Create a strategy for the fund raising process
- Determine deadline in conjunction with project needs. Depending on the availability of funding, phasing the project may be necessary.
- Create a fund raising package to present to potential donors
- Include cost estimates and itemized “wish list” to present to potential donors
- Compile a list of corporate and private donors
- Work with staff to create a system to track donations, deposit funds and process acknowledgments
- Public Relations – During the fund raising process make certain the process, from beginning to end, is done in a professional manner. Keep staff, town council and residents informed of the progress.
- Apply for available grants
- Consider establishing an endowment for ongoing maintenance costs
- Consider how best to acknowledge donors e.g. plaques

<b>Suggested Fund Raising Ideas</b>
-------------------------------------

- Auction/Sponsor Pews
- Auction Wedding Package – Include use of facility, stay at local hotel, dinner, flowers etc
- Dedicate/Sponsor the Restoration of Windows
- Donation Box at Spurwink Church (Envelopes to make a donation)
- Tours of the Spurwink Church
- Corporate Matching Funds e.g. Maine Community Foundation, Lions’ Club, Rotary, National Historic Preservation Commission
- Grants
- Grants may be available for the facility itself and collections belonging to the church.
- Sell Commemorative Gifts (e.g. Portland Head Light Gift Shop, local establishments)
  - Plates
  - Jewelry
  - Cast of Spurwink Church
  - Prints of Artist Painting – Commission Artist
  - Calendar
  - Holiday Ornaments
  - Mugs
- Family Fun Day Booth
- Bottle Shed
- In-kind services from local trades (e.g. electrical, grading, painting)

<b>Draft Time Line</b>
------------------------

*(The schedule depends on the timing of the completion of the final report, town council’s meeting schedule, the council’s decision of how and when to proceed and funding.)*

June/July 2006	Final Report Presented to the Town Council
August/September 2006	Workshop Review with the Town Council
Fall 2006	Appoint Fund Raising Committee
Winter 2006/Spring 2007	Fund Raising Begins
Fall/Winter 2007	Solicit Bids/Begin Construction

## Use and Ownership - Committee Charge #4

- Review and make a recommendation on the town's position on ownership and responsibility for the church.
- ❖ Excerpt from the Spurwink Church Study Committee Minutes March 15, 2006

Moved by Bruce Munger and Seconded by Jane Beckwith  
The Spurwink Church Study Committee recommends that the ownership and care of The Spurwink Church remain with the Town of Cape Elizabeth.

Motion passed unanimously.

- ❖ The committee expressed concern with available funding for ongoing maintenance of the Spurwink Church.

### **Suggestions:**

Establish an Endowment Fund  
Establishment of Friends Group  
Publicize Donations to the Existing Spurwink Church Fund

### ❖ Expanded Use

Traditionally events at the church include weddings, christenings, memorial services and funerals. Consideration was given to recommending the facility be opened evenings and year round. However many factors limit the possibility:

- The church parking lot across from the church is not suitable for wintertime use. The donation of this land was with a deed restriction that the lot remains as natural as possible.
- There is no location for additional parking – on or off street.
- Staffing – Full time staff would be needed to accommodate events and showings of the church year round. Would church funds sustain a full time position?
- Expenses – Would expanded use cover additional expenses and demands on the building?
- Heating – The building is not insulated, nor is it recommended.
- Lighting – There is one source of lighting within the church. Would additional lighting be needed? A public safety hazard exists with parking across the street and church visitors crossing the road on the corner of Spurwink Avenue and Bowery Beach Road/Route 77. Evening hours would create an added safety concern.
- Expanded use would expedite ongoing maintenance.

## Recommendations – Overall Work Projects

### Phase 1

- ❖ Construct a full frost wall around the exterior perimeter of the church. The recommendation provides a solution that will last for the next 100 years.
- ❖ Construct necessary grading, drainage, loam and seed.
- ❖ Construct a foundation drain with gravel splash bar to remove drainage away from the building.
- ❖ Remove the gutters in conjunction with the improved drainage to prevent adverse implications to the health of the building and the foundation.
- ❖ Following foundation work, review the status of the interior walls and plaster ceiling for possible damage. Experts recommend interior paint; plaster and floors should wait 2 years after the foundation work for settling.

### Phase 2

- ❖ Exterior clapboards spot paint and maintenance. Where necessary, remove existing paint to bare wood and recoat with four-coat system.
- ❖ Repair, spot paint and maintenance, replacement of clapboards, where necessary, on the steeple box. Ensure the structural integrity of the steeple and make the clapboards match the church itself.
- ❖ Repair windows to working order. Windows should be restored to their original function. Windows were installed to provide light and comfort to the facility. The original system used to open and close the windows should be used – authentic or reproduction.
- ❖ Refurbish outside decorative fans.
- ❖ Replace the front wooden and screen doors, stoop and repair the frame. Research is recommended to install doors proper to the historical period of the church.
- ❖ Remove the chimney and replace with a power vent system. The recommendation to remove the chimney was decided after much discussion. From a historical point of view, the chimney may or may not stand. The chimney was not part of the original structure. A power vent system is being recommended, therefore eliminating the need for the chimney. The committee voted to revert back to an earlier time when the chimney wasn't standing. Consideration should be given to the possibility of installing new

ductwork for the new heating system when the foundation is raised.

- ❖ Expose/Reopen and repair the upper level window at the rear of the church.

### **Phase 3**

- ❖ Repair and refinish vestibule ceiling. Based on the advice from the Maine Historic Preservation Commission, repair and stabilization is the appropriate preservation treatment, given the relatively good condition of the ceiling. Use of the same material is recommended.
- ❖ It is not recommended to add insulation to the outside walls. The building was built to carry out the air. Because moisture change is harmful to the plaster walls and ceiling, the facility should be kept at a constant humidity. This could be accomplished by replacing the heating system thermostat with a humidistat. This should allow heating the building to lower temperatures than it is now, and saving on fuel costs.
- ❖ Cleaning and minor repairs as needed.
- ❖ Seek advice from historical expert before bid packages are prepared.
- ❖ Require documentation (written and pictorial) for historical reference.
- ❖ Remove utilities off from the rear of the church.
- ❖ Long-range recommendation is to install underground utilities, eliminate overhead wires, in order to provide a clear view of the church.





Probable Construction Costs  
By Priority

<b>Phase 1 Foundation Stabilization and Drainage</b>				
<b>Foundation Reconstruction</b>	\$95,000.00			
Full frost wall around exterior perimeter				
<b>Loam and Seed</b>	\$1,500.00			
Assumes rough grading has been done as part of foundation earthwork				
\$0.35/SF unit cost				
<b>Regrade Area Adjacent to Route 77</b>	\$1,500.00			
Includes rough grading, loam and seed				
<b>Foundation Drain</b>	\$5,000.00			
<b>Remove Gutters</b>	\$800.00			
Remove existing gutters and downspout, touch-up exposed woodwork				
<b>Phase 1 Estimates</b>	<b>\$103,800.00</b>			
<b>Phase 2 Exterior</b>				
<b>Siding &amp; Exterior Woodwork, Exterior Paint</b>	\$50,000.00			
Remove existing paint to bare wood, recoat with four coat system, as necessary				
2000SF @\$20/SF				
Spot scrape and prime with full two top coats				
2000SF @\$5/SF				
<b>Steeple Box</b>	\$15,000.00			
Repair steeple, on steeple box replace wood with clapboards to match church				
Remove existing paint to bare wood and recoat with four coat system				
<b>Windows</b>	\$10,000.00			
Exterior repair with paint & putty maintenance				
10 windows @\$800/per window				
Interior repainting and restoring to original working condition				
10 windows @\$200/per window				
<b>Decorative Fans Above Windows</b>	\$6,000.00			
Refurbish with repairs and new paint				
10 fans @\$600/per fan				
<b>Exterior Doors</b>	\$5,000.00			

Probable Construction Costs  
By Priority

Replace exterior door(s), repair stoop and frame				
<b>Demolish and Dispose of Chimney</b>	\$1,800.00			
Install Power Vent System	\$3,500.00			
<b>Expose/Re-Open Upper Level Window At Rear of Church</b>				
Estimate for interior and exterior work	\$1,400.00			
<b>Phase 2 Estimates</b>	<b>\$92,700.00</b>			

Probable Construction Costs  
By Priority

<b>Phase 3 Interior</b>				
<b>Plaster Ceiling</b>	\$5,500.00			
Plaster stabilization and repair				
Spot paint maintenance and light cleaning				
<small>(The committee feels this estimate may be low, considering staging expenses and not knowing how much damage may be caused from the foundation work.)</small>				
<b>Walls</b>	\$500.00			
Light cleaning of plaster and wainscot				
<b>Pews</b>	\$500.00			
Light Cleaning				
<b>Vestibule Ceiling</b>	\$2,000.00			
Localized repairs and refinishing				
<b>Vestibule Walls</b>				
Routine cleaning only - no cost				
<b>Interior Doors</b>	\$600.00			
Refinish threshold, repair stop				
<b>Phase 3 Estimates</b>	<b>\$9,100.00</b>			
<b>Additional investigation before bid packages</b>	<b>\$3,000.00</b>			
<b>Documentation for historical reference</b>	<b>\$1,000.00</b>			
<b>50% Contingency for Phases 2 &amp; 3</b>	<b>\$50,900.00</b>			
<b>Endowment Fund</b>	<b>\$225,000.00</b>			
<b>Total Estimates</b>	<b>\$485,500.00</b>			
<b>Future Considerations</b>				
Underground Utilities	\$4,000.00			
Cost for installing underground power and phone \$40/linear ft.				
Routing power from a different pole, paving and relocating service entrance is not included.				
Elimination of overhead wires to provide clear view - rough estimate	\$30,000.00			