

Eastern Fire/EMS Substation Committee

Minutes

December 19, 2022

Attendance: All Members present; J. Green by Zoom excused early
Scott Gagne, Chief – Ex officio

Call to Order: 5:30 PM

- **Review of Minutes**

The Minutes of November 21 meeting were reviewed and approved by unanimous consent.

- **Review of the “Location” Subcommittee**

Jim Emerson reviewed the progress and work done by the Location subcommittee. There was a site visit and walk of the property at 79 Newtown Road that included the Code Enforcement Officer and City Engineer. This site is owned by UNE and would be donated to the City. It was concluded that in general the site was adequate with caveats that it needs to be evaluated for Vernal Pools (in early spring) as well as potential environmental contaminants, as it was an old St. Francis dump site.

A second location at the Pool Street side of 46 Old Pool Road was identified and a site visit conducted. This site is privately owned, and the owner has indicated the ability to subdivide and sell “at market”. This site also at initial review, appeared acceptable, and also would need to be evaluated for Vernal Pools.

Although neither site is ideal, the Committee then discussed the various pros and cons of these sites. It also indicated it would further evaluate these as well as explore any other possible sites.

With that in mind, the Subcommittee put forth the following formal recommendation to the Committee as a whole:

The formal recommendation for a potential Eastern Biddeford Fire/EMS Substation should be located in a 1-mile radius of the intersection Pool Street and Newtown Road, with the exact location be determined in the future.

The recommendation was seconded and approved unanimously by those present.

- **Review of the “Staffing and Equipment” Subcommittee**

Pat Boston reviewed the progress and work done by the Subcommittee. Although there were no recent Subcommittee meetings, she summarized their work. The Chief again reviewed the current shift staffing by equipment with potential staffing growth alternatives (see attached).

The Committee then discussed that the likely need was for one additional Fire/EMS staff per shift, which would allow for a Substation to be manned 24/7 by two full time individuals. This would bring the current budgeted department staffing from the current budget of 48 total department personnel to 52. It was floated as a possible recommendation that two additional staff be included in the upcoming budget consideration and an additional two in the subsequent year’s budget. After further discussion, it was agreed to defer this recommendation until we have had a chance to review the consultants from CPSM’s report, as this will most probably have very clear guidelines on department staffing.

The Committee then reviewed the discussion by the Subcommittee on potential equipment for a Substation. The Subcommittee put forth the following formal recommendation to the Committee as a whole:

The formal recommendation on Equipment is to relocate the 2005 Firetruck (equipped with appropriate EMS equipment) to the potential Substation. Any future equipment would be part of the annual CIP budget review and normal Fire Department equipment rotation policy.

The recommendation was seconded and approved unanimously by those present.

- **General Committee Discussion on “Size and Scope” of a Substation**

A general Committee discussion followed on the “size and scope” of a substation, led by Paul Labrecque. The purpose of the discussion is to begin to narrow down a recommendation that is required to ensure the potential physical footprint can fit on a site, as well as to understand the potential Costs. With current high inflation and dramatically increasing construction costs a ballpark of \$400 to \$500 per square foot (or higher) are the potential building costs. Therefore, understanding a range in the square foot size is important to give a range of potential costs to Council.

After reviewing the requirements and needs of a substation with the Chief a rough outline of various potential designs emerged including:

9,500 sq ft – Would include Three double apparatus bays, 6 dormitories, 3 Bathrooms, Kitchen/common area, Decon/laundry, and substantial storage; (a total physical footprint including paved areas of about 250 ft x 250 ft)

7,800 sq ft – Three single apparatus bays, 6 dormitories, 3 Bathrooms, Kitchen/common area, Decon/laundry, and substantial storage (slightly smaller footprint)

7,000 sq ft – Two double apparatus bays (built to be easily expanded), 4 dormitories, 2 Bathrooms, Kitchen/common area, Decon/laundry, and smaller storage (smaller footprint)

6,000 sq ft – Two single apparatus bays (built to be easily expanded), 3 dormitories, 2 Bathrooms, Kitchen/common area, smaller Decon/laundry, and smaller storage (smallest footprint)

All of these alternatives have positives and negatives, and it was clearly expressed that the Committee desires to provide alternatives that are rational. The potential construction costs therefore could range between \$3 and \$5 million. We need to ensure that any recommendation is financially acceptable to the community at large. Further discussion will occur on this issue.

- **Other Business**

Chairman Emhiser pointed out that he has requested the City Staff explore possible funding grants that may be able to be applied for to help mitigate taxpayer costs of a potential substation. He hopes to have some indication of possible available grants prior to the final report.

Finally, the Chief indicated that the Consultants for CPSM have not yet submitted their report, and he hoped to have it in early January. It was agreed that this now becomes the gating item for the Committee as a whole, therefore we will not schedule our next meeting until we have received and reviewed the report.

- **The meeting was unanimously adjourned at 7:35pm**

Report by the Location Subcommittee



	PROs	CONs
79 Newtown Road	Generally in centralized population and housing unit location	Not on main artery
	Appears to have adequate buildable area	Potential Vernal Pools
	Not in evacuation zone	Access to Pool Street traverses an intersection
	Entry to Pool Street in 35 MPH zone	On Newtown Road, a smaller side road
	Water main access reasonably possible	
	UNE is open to concept	
	Close to UNE	

- Note: 1) Lot sub-division would be required
 2) Would require rezoning from Institutional to RF
 3) No formal discussions regarding consideration for land transfer has happened
 4) PROs and CONs are not listed in priority order or given any weighting

	PROs	CONs
46 Old Pool (with access on Pool Street)	Generally in centralized population and housing unit location	Potential Vernal Pools
	Appears to have adequate buildable area	Entry to Pool Street in 55 MPH zone
	Not in evacuation zone	Water main access very challenging (<i>from Old Pool to Pool</i>)
	Owner is open to concept	Site is topographically below Pool Street, requires significant fill
	Reasonably close to UNE	Further from Central Station
	Direct access to Pool Street	Site has significant outcroppings

- Note: 1) Lot sub-division would be required
 2) No formal discussions regarding consideration for land transfer has happened
 3) PROs and CONs are not listed in priority order or given any weighting

Apparatus Staffing

Engine	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	 Central Station  Sub Station
Ambulance	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	
Truck/Brush 20/SH 34	3	3	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	
Ambulance	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	
OIC / Command	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Engine/Ambulance	5	4	4	3	2	2	1			
Staffing/Shift:	16	15	14 (16)	13 (15)	12 (14)	11 (13)	10 (12)	9 (11)	8 (10)	

Full Staffing per shift (4 total shifts) is in parenthesis allowing for 2 individuals per shift out sick or on vacation

Apparatus in bold are cross staff. Only one of the apparatus in bold can be staffed at a time putting the others OOS.