

Safety Facilities Evaluation Committee Meeting Notes

25 Oct 23 @6 PM

Committee Members: Dave Copeland, Justin Miller, Michael Moore, Kevin Madison, Hal Kreider, Tom Chase (alternate), Kurt Straube (alternate)

Advisors: Town Administrator Neil Irvine, Fire Chief Mark Tetreault, Police Chief Glen Drolet

Reviewed and discussed information requested at previous meeting

ISO ratings / Insurance rates

Not a big factor for homeowners

Not all companies use it in setting their homeowner rates

More of an impact on industrial / commercial

5-road-mile component does affect rating of 10 (the Gulf) vs. 9 (rest of town)

Cannot cover entire town with one facility

East Facility can be no further west than Gary Road

West Facility cannot be further east than Jeffry Drive

Expected tax rate impact of bonding is approximately \$0.72 per thousand

Range is \$0.42 to \$0.90 per thousand

Impact decreases as the bond is paid off and there is less interest to be paid

Term of bond affects the bond interest rate

Rates are considerably lower than mortgage rates

Bonds are easily refinanced if interest rates go down

Facility space requirements

One Central Facility (option 1) would need ~ 18,000 sq. ft. – all new construction

Use of Narrows (Option 2) would require ~ 18,600 sq. ft. – 15,600 new construction

600 sq ft additional is due to space inefficiencies at the Narrows

Exact amount of space could be affected by site conditions

Numbers cannot be finalized until site is selected

Discussion on what option to recommend

Police Chief is neutral on option 1 vs. option 2

Need to consider if a site would be compromised if there is a major incident

Sites near existing public facilities would not be viewed as favorably

His big concern is that the project is critical and needs to be done as soon as possible

Fire Chief recommends going with two facilities (Option 2)

We need to think about how the town will grow

One facility will not serve the population projected for life of bond

May ultimately end up with 3 facilities – very costly

With two facilities we can provide good coverage for the life of the bond

Committee concurred with Fire Chief and voted to recommend Option 2

Better service

No anticipated changes to insurance

Lower cost due to less new construction

Discussed next Steps

Do not think Town will support a request for funds unless we have details on what is being built

Cannot specify the building without knowing the site

Insufficient time to request land proposals and do architectural design before March 24 vote

Committee thinks best course of action is:

Request funding for architectural design this year

Take into consideration funds already approved for this purpose (in CRF?)

Seek proposals for land options early 2024

Be ready to work on evaluation of land options and design right after March vote

Finalize what we will propose and put facility on 2025 ballot

In parallel to all the above, work on public education campaign

Next Meeting

Primary focus will be on education campaign

Schedule for 21 Nov at 6 PM