

Richland County Joint Ambulance Committee:  
Strategic Planning for EMS Subcommittee

June 17, 2020

Minutes

Present: Brian McGraw, Sharon Schmitz, Mary Rognholt, Glen Niemeyer, Darin Gudgeon, Via Zoom: Bob Holets, Paul Kardatzke (Jewell and Associates).

Not Present: N/A

1. Meeting was called to order at 19:03.
2. Notification of the meeting had been made and the agenda was posted.
3. Committee attendance was as noted above, with a quorum.
4. A motion was made by Niemeyer to approve the agenda. It was seconded by Schmitz. The agenda was approved.
5. A motion was made by Holets to approve the previous Subcommittee meeting minutes as presented. Motion seconded by Rognholt. The motion carried.
6. Discussion regarding the Jewell and Associates report began with questions regarding the price for the Sextonville property, as it had been discussed in previous meetings that the quoted \$400,000 price may not be firm and that there was also insurance money that was going to be put into the remodel. Holets also noted that the estimated price on the retaining wall was double what he had received quoted to him. He also reported that he had heard there was an issue with water in the basement of the REC building. Gudgeon stated that he had spoken with Gregg Vetesnik prior to the meeting and he'd confirmed that the price was firm at \$400,000 and stated there was about \$100,000 in insurance money that was to be put into the remodel as a result of the fire last fall. This could potentially drop the remodel estimates to about \$200,000. Vetesnik did stated that if it was appraised at a lower value, a reasonable offer would be considered. It was noted that the REC building was zoned as non-conforming residential. Kardatzke stated that he did not see any sign of water damage either by sight or smell in the basement and noted that there appeared to be an extensive system to keep it dry. Looking at the spreadsheet comparison of the buildings, Kardatzke stated that the numbers they had placed were assumptive and encouraged the Committee to use this spreadsheet at a template to discuss priority of needs and the best building to fit. He also stated they can do a map to show estimated responder times for paid-on-call staff. For the rest of the report, he stated that the dollar figures are estimates which can be solidified once the preferred location is determined. He noted some of the costs may not come to fruition and some items may be able to be postponed initially, though the sprinkler system and HVAC would be required for code compliance. For the Sextonville property retaining wall, he stated they used poured concrete as their material. It was noted that the retaining wall may be a complex issue, as there is not much space between the properties and there may be a zoning compliance issue as well. Similarly, there may be a zoning compliance issue to the north based on the set back from property lines.

There would also need to be an easement for the driveway access. Gudgeon pointed out to the group that the HVAC system would need to be capable of immediate shut down due to proximity to facilities with hazardous chemicals. Niemeyer noted that an agreement would also need to be in place in the case that the ambulance would be unable to respond due to sheltering in place in such an event. For the REC building, Kardatzke stated that the building was considered demolished for the purposes of their report, but stated that depending upon the condition of the building, the office and ambulances could potentially be moved into the permanent structure and the living quarters could be located to the house until the appropriate remodel was completed. The sprinkler system is not required until sleeping quarters are located within the building. Darin will arrange to have Kardatzke look at the house and will plan to attempt parking an ambulance in the REC garage due to concerns over door width.

7. In discussion on a preferred building location, the first concern was traffic safety. Gudgeon noted that both have complications. He believed that the REC building can be remedied by policy with no response to or from a scene on Jefferson (unless the call was located in that area). The Sextonville location would have issues for pulling an ambulance out safely due to visibility to the north. The general consensus was that the report presented by Kardatzke did establish an apples to apples comparison. Gudgeon stated that Vetesnik is hoping to have an answer soon, as the building has been empty since last fall. There was discussion about supporting the community by helping fill the most beneficial building. The REC building was off the tax roll. The question was raised as to which building may be more easily reincorporated into the community after having been remodeled to fit for the Service, should the Service ever move. There was a noted concern that both properties were going to require more investment that the Service has at this time. In order to commit to either building, further funding needed to be identified. Gudgeon stated that he would send out the Jewell and Associates report to the Service members for their input. The Subcommittee members determined that they were not ready to make a recommendation to the Committee at this time.
8. Niemeyer made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Rognholt. The meeting was adjourned at 20:50.