

**COMMUNITY CENTER BUILDING COMMITTEE
MEETING AGENDA**

6:00 PM THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 6, 2025

GRANT HOUSE

- **Call to Order**
- **Public Comments**
- **Approval of Minutes of October 23, 2025**
- **Capital Campaign**
- **Public Funding Ideas**
- **Discussion of Selectboard Update**
- **BH&A Site Plan and Discussion**
- **Communication Subcommittee Webpage Update**
- **Other Items**
- **Action Items and Next Meeting Date**

COMMUNITY CENTER BUILDING COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES

6:00 PM THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 6, 2025

GRANT HOUSE

6:00 PM – Regular Community Center Building Committee

Present: Greg Fyfe, Bill Olsen, Richard Raimondi, Gregory Schwab, Brianna Scott, Peter Murray (ex-officio), Robert Palmer (ex officio) and Jacqueline Crafts (alternate)

Absent: David Cohen and Adam Gould

Others Present: Alyssa Wright (Wright Collective founder and principal consultant and York resident)

Call to Order

Chair Olsen called the meeting to order at 6 pm.

1) Public Comments

There were no public comments.

2) Approval of the October 23rd Committee Meeting Minutes

Raimondi moved that the minutes from the October 23rd meeting of the Community Center Building Committee (CCBC) be accepted as distributed; Fyfe seconded, and the motion passed without objection: Vote: 5-0.

3) Capital Campaign

Olsen welcomed Wright to the meeting. Murray reported that he has been in conversation with Wright, and she had agreed to come to tonight's meeting to share ideas on starting a capital campaign for the project. Wright said that as a resident of York Village with a family, she is very excited about the community center project. She stated that she was happy to come to tonight's meeting and share some ideas for a capital campaign. She presented a slide show entitled "Alternative Funding Models: Exploring Integrated Capital." Wright explained that one of the key objectives in developing a successful campaign is the creation of a capital stack involving philanthropy as a key component. She presented the following ideas/concepts:

- A. A slide illustrating a \$13 million dollar campaign that included equity, grants/gifts, city/state funding, and longer-term “friendly impact” loans;
- B. Asking philanthropic entities to fund a portion of the project with loans at a lower interest rate than is available commercially;
- C. Currently now is a good time to ask for philanthropic assistance as tax laws are changing in 2026;
- D. Philanthropic entities are looking to leave a legacy; so, they are willing to fund a project and have their names attached to the it;
- E. There are many residents of York and the seacoast area, either full-time or seasonal, who come from family-wealth and are interested in supporting the community center;
- F. It is common for multi-generational, familial philanthropic entities to want to see the impact of their funds while the grandparents are still living; so, it isn’t unusual for a group of relatives to all co-fund a component in a capital campaign;
- G. Current philanthropic trends show that a capital campaign focusing on finding a source to fund the pool or the gymnasium will be much more successful than a “buy a brick” campaign;
- H. Financial institutions all have a philanthropic arm and are very interested in having their names attached to civic projects;
- I. Donor Advised Funds (DAFs) are on the rise in philanthropic circles and are easier to navigate and have a faster response than traditional family foundations;
- J. The midterm elections of 2026 may have an impact of giving (political versus charitable giving);
- K. Women donors steward investment and giving strategies as their wealth grows;
- L. Philanthropic agencies are apt to fund projects that intersect with its interests;
- M. Engaging community partnerships by identifying how they can build a campus community through the project;
- N. The possibility of using program-related investments (PRIs) and mission-related investments (MRIs) in communicating with potential donor agencies;

O. A list of potential resources in the development of a capital campaign, and

P. Revenue streams may include the following:

- i. Individual donations;
- ii. Major gifts of \$5,000 or more;
- iii. Corporate grants/sponsorships;
- iv. In-kind donations;
- v. Private grants;
- vi. Government grants and contracts;
- vii. Events/Products/Services; and
- viii. Bequests.

Following the presentation, CCBC members discussed with Wright the following concepts/ideas:

- A. Wright responded to Olsen's inquiry that phrases such as food security, wellness, systemic change, community hub and mental health may trigger interest from philanthropic entities;
- B. Palmer asked Wright about the time needed for a capital campaign; to which she responded that a year is generally needed;
- C. Olsen and Murray recapped elements of the proposed community center as they stand (potential site; components of the facility; estimated cost; timeline; and options for a phased project);
- D. Wright commented that philanthropic entities appreciate when projects are not drug out and that they would rather donate or make a lower-interest loan to the project instead of having the mill rate raised;
- E. Wright suggested giving area estate lawyers and planners a "hot sheet" of philanthropic opportunities associated with the project;
- F. Murray noted that there are uncertainties related to the project (i.e.: location, voter approval, etc.) and, therefore, when would be the time for the capital campaign; Wright responded that communication can occur with the funders relating where in the process the project is, the flexibility that is available to them, and that benchmarks can be set regarding their gifts/loans. She further stated that philanthropic entities like to be on the journey with the project;

- G. Giving the funders options, such as with this amount of money the project would look like this, but with these additional funds then the facility would look/include this;
 - H. Wright urged the CCBC to get a 501(3)(c) fundraising arm started to be the source for contributions for the project during both the construction and the operational phases and as a grassroots promoter of the campaign;
 - I. Wright responded to Craft's inquiry concerning the availability of fundraising templates by saying that she will share some with the committee;
 - J. Wright mentioned that lists of potential donors should be developed from area sources (i.e.: public library, civic organizations, public entities) and then standard wealth screenings can be done to determine the amount that could be requested from them; Olsen and Palmer agreed to investigate what network/pools could be legally explored to develop the donors list; and
 - K. Interest in hiring a director for the capital campaign was discussed; Wright suggested putting out a Request for Proposal (RFP) for the position.
- Wright reiterated her excitement and interest in the community center project and stated that people love York and would be excited to be a part of the project. The committee thanked Wright for her time and expertise. Then the members discussed the process to create the Friends of the York Community Center, creating the fact sheet to distribute to the financial/estate planners and other potential philanthropic agencies, and making the capital campaign component the focus for the next year as the final designs and the project site are finalized.

4) **Public Funding Idea**

Olsen opened the meeting to public funding ideas to offset the cost of the project. Considered topics included the following:

- A. Olsen related that the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania has a transfer tax on the sale of real estate and wondered if a transfer tax would be an option as a capital funding source for the town. Palmer related that Maine has a transfer tax that is currently used for housing and that the Maine legislature has not been able to pass legislation regarding taxes levied on the civic level;

- B. Offering various organizations, corporations or individuals to name elements in the facility for monetary support of the project (i.e.: naming the pool facility, the gymnasium or a multi-purpose room);
- C. The use of a TIF grant for the project was discussed;
- D. Fund-raising ideas, such as a brick drive and a pledge campaign were offered;
- E. The need for a capital fund director was mentioned;
- F. State and area foundations, such as the Alford Foundation, which could donate a significant amount toward the project were discussed; and
- G. Members discussed the need to create The Friends of the York Community Center as a 501(c)(3) organization to help raise funding for the construction and the operating of the facility.

5) **Discussion of Selectboard Update**

Olsen stated that the project's presentation to the Capital Planning Committee (CPC) has been canceled due to moving the project to the May 2027 ballot.

Palmer mentioned that the project was included in the town's five-year capital campaign plan.

The committee then focused on the development of the update to be presented to the Selectboard at the end-of-the month. Discussion of the presentation included the following points:

- A. Olsen suggested that the slide show presentation should include the CCBC's actions/decisions from June through the present, the decision to formulate a fundraising and support arm of the project, and the intention of doing more community outreach during the charrettes in 2026;
- B. Palmer said that he would communicate to Peter Joseph, York Town Manager, and to the CPC about the committee's intention of having several charrettes to gather community input on the project and develop buy-in for the project;
- C. Murray related that Joel Bargmann said that he would participate in the charrettes as part of his service;
- D. Murray offered to supply the project design plans and photos for the Selectboard presentation;
- E. Crafts suggested that we use a sampling of public comments that have been given either in-person or on the website;

- F. Murray said that he met with representatives of the York Climate Action Committee recently and that they agreed to partner with the committee on the development of an energy efficient plan for the project; and
- G. Olsen suggested that slides be included to show all of the components of the facility, the community groups that would benefit from each component, the rationale for two pools in the facility, and the overall purpose of the community center project.

6) **BH&A Site Plan and Discussion**

Olsen asked about the current project designs from Bargmann Hendrie and Archetype (BH&A).

- A. Murray stated that he was still working with Joel Bargmann on changes to the latest project plans;
- B. Fyfe mentioned that there still is an issue with access to the pool and the gym from the locker rooms. Additional doors from the men's and women's locker rooms need to be added to prevent a constant "wet" hall from the pool; and
- C. Scott noted that the family changing room is still missing from the designs.

7) **Communication Subcommittee Webpage Update**

Scott presented the October update for the project website and Facebook page. It was accepted by the committee without changes. Murray stated that he would post the update onto the Parks and Recreation website tomorrow.

8) **Other Items**

Olsen asked if the CCBC members had any other items to discuss.

- A. Palmer reported that the Selectboard had interviewed a candidate for the vacancy on the CCBC. Members discussed the discrepancy between the committee charter regarding the number of alternate members for the CCBC and what is posted on the town website. Palmer stated that he would investigate what was decided by the Selectboard in regard to the membership makeup of the CCBC before the Selectboard appointing anyone else to the committee; and
- B. Due to the uncertainty of the York School reorganization timeline, Scott questioned when the CCBC should pivot from the Village Elementary School (VES) site to another town property. Members responded with the following ideas:

- i. The possibility of using the Short Sands Road property for the project by building up from the flood plain and modifying the Feasibility Study design for the building;
- ii. The possibility of the York School reorganization capital plan warrant being voted down in May 2026 and the plan being implemented without any additional funds; and
- iii. The use of Coastal Ridge Elementary School (CRES) property if it becomes available and using funds raised by the Friends of the York Community Center to fund a feasibility study for the site.

9) **Action Items and Next Meeting Date**

A. The main action items are as follows:

- i. Murray will set up a CCBC update at the Monday, November 24th a Selectboard meeting;
- ii. Murray to work with BH&A on site plan changes;
- iii. Olsen and Palmer to investigate potential sources from which to develop the potential donors list;
- iv. The Communication subcommittee to work on update presentation for the Selectboard; and
- v. Palmer to investigate CCBC membership charter.

B. The next regularly scheduled meeting will be Thursday, November 20 at 6 pm at the Grant House. The final 2025 meeting will be on December 4 at 6 pm at the Grant House.

Adjourn

Raimondi moved that meeting be adjourned; Fyfe seconded, and the motion passed without objection: Vote: 6-0.

At 8:07 pm Chair Bill Olsen adjourned the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,
Gregory Schwab
Secretary