

**Station 28**

12/10/06 28 W, 1 I - + 17 - 17

Construction continues at 3500 Forestville Road. More pictures, including views of the rest of the intersection, appearing momentarily on [Mike's photo site](#).



Mike, It would be nice if the links to Lee's pictures opened up in a separate window so you don't have to press back 200 times to get back to the photos page.

**guest** - 12/10/06 - 19:02

Thanks for the feedback. Usability studies that I have read indicate that users as a whole do NOT prefer links that generate new windows. However, you can open new browser windows yourself. Before clicking on a link with your primary (left) mouse button, click instead using your secondary (right) mouse button. This will generate a menu that includes the option Open Link in New Window (or similar).

Also, consider bookmarking the photo site, so you can move forward from the page any number of times, and then immediately return by clicking a bookmark (also called Favorites in Internet Explorer).

**Legeros** - 12/10/06 - 20:01

Alas, links on this blog sometimes open with new windows. I don't have control over those, however.

**Legeros** - 12/10/06 - 20:04

Is this station the same design as 26 & 27?

**WCFireman** - 12/10/06 - 22:31

Same architect, and three bays instead of just two. That's about all I know.

**Legeros** - 12/10/06 - 22:51

from the blueprints, it looks like a design of its own. (the blueprints are in the white box. just go look at them one weekend). you have to see the station in person to really get an idea of how far back the bays are sitting compared to the living qtrs. it looks like its a really well designed station with lots of space.

**pal** - 12/12/06 - 09:55

My question is the 3 bays, does the city have plans to put a ladder or a rescue truck in future?

**WCFireman** - 12/12/06 - 13:22

no, a ladder won't go there due to it being the farthest station out. however, there is rumor of there being a L-27 when the next ladder truck comes in. c-3 said that he has wanted stations to be built with 3 bays for a while now but could never get it approved in the budget but somehow made it happen this time. supposedly all the antiques will go to #28 when opened.

**pal** - 12/12/06 - 22:14

Space is certainly needed. By my count, the city has 77 "spaces" at the stations, and 66 pieces of equipment that are or should be stored indoors: 28 front-line engines, 7 reserve engines, 7 front-line ladders, 3 reserve ladders, 3 front-line rescues, 1 reserve rescue, 2 haz-mat units, 1 haz-mat support unit, 1 mobile command post, 3 mini pumpers, 4 antiques, 4 battalion chiefs, 1 investigator's van, and 1 air truck. Add that apparatus bays are used for fitness equipment in many stations and you have a definite need for space.

There's also equipment that's stored outdoors (including at the training center): 2 USAR units, 2 1/2 haz-mat support units, 1 mass-casualty unit, 1 school bus, etc.

**Legeros** - 12/12/06 - 22:45

We've heard the same speculation that the eighth ladder company, when that happens, will be L27. We've also heard that the ninth ladder company will be L4, with nearby L16 moved westward to balance things out.

**Legeros** - 12/12/06 - 22:54

Whatever happened to T-12/ L-12? Originally, a ladder was supposed to go to 12, after a re-model job was done at #12. Then they put it at 26, which is far out. 12 seems like it would be a much better location for a ladder versus 26.

Brings me to another question; don't you think it's better to have ladder companies in a more central location, versus on the fringe of a district? Look at 26 and 20, doesn't seem like you are getting the most out of your ladder companies when you have them on the edge.

**Guest** - 12/13/06 - 12:10

Due to budget, the addition to sta. 12 has been put on hold probably until the completion of #28 which has an expected completion date of the end of March/first of April. L-26 is supposed to move to #12 after the addition/bay expansion. A ladder co. is supposed to serve a circle of 3 stations in addition to it's own station's territory. At #26, it can only serve 2 since there isn't a station farther out. That is the reason L-24 became L-23 (it serves 23 + 24,18,17).

**pal** - 12/13/06 - 18:24

Yeah, look at L-20. It only serves 20,8 and part of 2. When it was at 8 it served 5, 8, 20 and part of 14. Too bad it has a basement. I'm not a structural engineer, but, if you extended the front of #8 would it displace enough weight off of the floor for a heavier unit? Just wondering because we always think of extending "out the back", but not "out the front".

**Guest** - 12/13/06 - 20:15

Station 12 housed a service ladder truck from 1980 to 1988. Truck 12 operated a 1980 Ford that was moved to Station 15 on September 20, 1988. If I recall my research correctly, its last months (maybe many months) were spent out of service. Its personnel, a three-person crew I believe, filled in on whatever companies were short.

Truck 26 is the city's seventh ladder company. It was placed in service on August 6, 2005. It was originally planned for Station 12, which would have required expansion of that facility. (Both in the bays, for the truck, and the living space, for the additional personnel.) The station expansion didn't happen / hasn't happened yet, due to funding.

Other station expansions that come to mind: Station 15 was expanded some years ago, with rear apparatus doors added (and a raised rear roof line) so the 1988 Pierce Snorkel could be housed there. The doors and driveway angle preventing the rig from exiting from the front. They also trimmed a curb on the driveway leading to the rear of the station, to accommodate the truck's turning radius.

Station 11 was expanded in the 1989 or 1990, it's doors and maybe even the roof raised to accommodate the 1990 Spartan ladder. Station 16 was expanded in 1979 or 1980, its rear apparatus door and wall removed, and a metal "shelter" constructed to accommodate the 1979 Mack / 1958 American LaFrance tiller that was just a tad too long for the firehouse.

Which stations are too small for ladder trucks? Probably 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, and 14. There's a weight limit at 8, I believe, that precludes anything but a twin-axle truck.

**Legeros** - 12/13/06 - 20:48

Forgot the most recent station expansion, Station 23, with proper-sized living space added for not just the engine company, but an added truck company. Ergo why the city's sixth truck company served at Station 24, until the Station 23 renovations happened.

**Legeros** - 12/13/06 - 21:00

Now that the shop is gone, a ladder might fit at #2 if the back wall of the bays is removed. Not sure what kind of structural integrity would be affected though. A few more years and #3 will be replaced, maybe it will be big enough then?

**Guest** - 12/14/06 - 13:27

This does bring to light an interesting trend in emergency station designs everywhere- failure to plan. Who, when station 12 was built, ever envisioned what has happened in that area? And when many of these stations were built, there were no rear-mount platforms. A lot of Raleigh's fire stations were built for open-cab American LaFrance pumpers. Even the Mack CF's were not much bigger. And who would have ever thought that RFD would be getting rescue units like the ones rumored? As to other stations, FVFD #1 is kind of tight personnel wise- there is only sleeping quarters for 4 fire personnel and 2 EMS personnel. Even some of the EMS stations fall into this category, like EMS-2, which was designed for the old Dodge/Swab units. Who then ever dreamed we would be building ambulances on Freightliner, IHC, and Sterling chassis?

Maybe the third bay at #28 is for a co-quartered EMS unit. I would think there is a need in that area...

**DJ** - 12/14/06 - 13:28

Maybe it's time to consider re-building some existing stations so they can accomodate properly? Costly yes, but who would've known?

**Silver** - 12/14/06 - 14:59

With the population and development growth inside the City of Raleigh there is a need to build stations between existing stations. It only takes 1 working fire or 2 fire alarms to clean out an entire region of units. The current response (number of units) to alarms will probably be increasing in the near future and that will further deplete available units.

**ncff123** - 12/14/06 - 15:35

Current response is probably increasing in the near future?? We haven't heard about that. Four engines instead of three? Two ladders instead of one? Four and two, Philly style?

**Legeros** - 12/14/06 - 17:56

Should Raleigh have bigger stations? Certainly. Can the city afford bigger stations? Don't know. What's happened in comparable cities, like Greensboro or Charlotte? Do they find the funds and justification to rebuild facilities built before, say, 1970 or 1960? Does station replacement require repurposing the older facilities, or sale of the land and/or buildings?

Comparing Raleigh station sizes, Station 27 on Buffaloe Road contains 6,873 square-feet of living and apparatus area. Let's add another 1,000 square-feet for a third bay and presume that 8,000 square-feet is the minimum required size for new Raleigh fire stations. That figure puts makes just about every station too small.

See this facility summary for their sizes and specs: <http://legeros.com/ralwake/raleigh/histo..>

Smallest to largest are:

- 3 – 3,564 planned for replacement
- 14 – 3,616 previously planned for replacement
- 16 – 3,984
- 12 – 4,189 planned for expansion
- 8 – 4,275 excludes basement
- 10 – 4,327
- 9 – 4,500
- 7 – 4,584
- 2 – 4,600 excludes shop
- 5 – 4,627
- 17 – 4,875
- 11 – 4,923
- 20 – 5,168
- 18 – 5,185

22 – 5,222

21 – 5,225

19 – 5,293

4 – 5,298

6 – 5,408

25 – 5,640

15 – 5,664

24 – 5,710

27 – 6,873

26 – 7,258 excludes back-up 911 center

23 – 7,709 recently expanded with additional living space

1 – 11,200

**Legeros** - 12/14/06 - 18:09

Currently our high rise procedures are being overhauled. Yes, changing the responses is a proposal. It just doesn't make sense for an outbuilding and a 10 story apartment building to yield the same level of response. Thus, the proposed "beefing up" of our big box alarms....which is a great step in my opinion.

**Silver** - 12/14/06 - 18:43

While the financial situation is slightly different down here in Charlotte, almost every station built since the late 70's is large enough to handle the modern apparatus and any changes to the apparatus and staff. Charlotte learned a lesson after it built station 19 with only one bay, and that was to build with a minimum of 2 bays, and usually three on the newer stations such as 32, 36, and 37. To see a monster of a station check out the new station 10, with at least four bays to house, the engine, rescue, bat chief, dive support... The oldest functioning stations in Charlotte such as 5,6,7 are all able somehow to fit the new smel engines which are about 96 inches wide, and the slightly wider ALF's. It is always better to build and not need it than need it and have to build it later, which can be hard to explain to taxpayers but in the end saves a lot of money... usually. If I recall when Charlotte built the new station 10 it ran into some cost overruns and cost a pretty penny in the end.

**guest** - 12/14/06 - 19:04

Increasing response is well overdue. 4 Engines, 2 Ladders, 2 Rescues, 2 Chiefs, 1 Support Unit, and 1 EMS for high hazard is very popular in the bigger cities. We shall see.

**ncff123** - 12/15/06 - 18:16

A "high risk" fire alarm in Charlotte gets 1E, 1L, and 1BC. A "high risk" working fire (first alarm) is: 4E, 2L, 1R, 2BC.

Here is a link to CFD's stations: <http://www.pbase.com/pski/cfdstations&pa..>

There are no pictures of the new Station 37, only of the temporary "station." Also, the tower at station 10 can be used for training.

It is my understanding, after taking to a D.C., that all stations currently being built/in the planning stages will be 3 bays in order to accommodate any future additions. (See stations 31-36.)

**Luke** - 12/16/06 - 01:00

123, I like the 4 and 2 response, but I think 1 rescue is sufficient.

**Guest** - 12/16/06 - 11:31

As Raleigh runs two-person Rescues, the comparable big-city response might be one or two (!) more four-person companies.

**Legeros** - 12/16/06 - 11:36

how does Raleigh use their Rescue companies on working fires? AKA what is their main role when on the scene?

**CFP 7021** - 12/16/06 - 12:49

Depending on the crew and arrival order, the current 2-man crew performs anything from a primary, a secondary or rehab. In the ol' days, rescue was known for their excellent gatorade mixing skills (hahaha), nowadays things have changed. Rescue crews are more aggressive and EMS is performing more of the rehab role.

To me, sending 2 rescues and 2 ladders on a "big box" would deplete your extrication capabilities dramatically in an area, especially as spread out as Raleigh is. Perhaps if the rescues were staffed with 4 and a few more ladder companies were added to the city, the hole wouldn't be as

big.

But I agree, the responses to larger structures versus smaller ones (and ones with greater life hazard) should be different.

**Silver** - 12/16/06 - 14:13

I agree with you all! There is no telling what the future will hold for us at RFD. I'd love to see 4 people on the rescues coming from a rescue station there is no need for us to role out or up on a working fire with 2 people to search much less rescue. But I am going to leave that one up to the new Chief we know he is from a much bigger city with a much bigger FD! Now for the comment about a county EMS at station 28, I doubt it! 1st Because Rolesville EMS is right down the street and they already run in that area. 2nd because a little Birdie told me that the original plans were to have a county building at the rear of the lot that would house EMS but it got scratched!!!!By the county. Think about all of the USAR and Hazmat equipment that is kept outside non fenced in areas like 7,20,22. Plus by putting specialty equipment out there as a regional team(USAR 8 and RRT 4 they are close to 540. You know like station 27. But that is just me. Y'all stay safe.

**Jason Lane** - 12/18/06 - 01:06

I think to ease the apparatus tug that Raleigh has when they tone out for structure fires etc, they should do what Durham does, use the counties specialized units to their benefit. Example in Durham if a structure fire is toned out in station 13's area then Bethedas ladder is going to be going because they are the closest ladder. We all talk about how great closet unit dispatch is, well Durham has got it. Example how this would help Raleigh, i'll use Rescue 14 and Durham Highway Rescue 5 as examples. Raleigh currently responds to 10-50s on 540 by themselves at lumbly rd and Glenwood rd, so if a call comes in 10-50 vehicle overturned at one of those addresses the dispatch is either E23/24 depending on the exit, L23 and R14. DHR5 is much closer than R14 so why not dispatch it as the rescue for the box? Same would go for structure fires, and other calls in which R5 or other county rescue, or ladder are closer than a city ladder, or rescue. This makes sense why not use it?

**somethinglikeDFD?** - 12/18/06 - 22:48

You have to take staffing levels into account, as well as training unfortunately. Though Durham Highway might not be affected, others are. Take Apex for example. I know they won't respond into the city, but, the staffing on their ladder goes from 0, to 1, all the way to 4 at any given time.

Take Western Wake; is the rescue unit at Western Wake always staffed? And, is it staffed with qualified personnel?

**Guest** - 12/19/06 - 02:57

Until the county comes up with a standard for level of training to ride an aerial, rescue and engine, I'd say that's a "no go". You atleast want a guideline for what you'll be "getting" on a ladder or rescue when they come to help.

I'll refer back to P.G. County Maryland, again. They have standards set and required training to be qualified to ride an aerial or rescue company. Works well I think.

**Silver** - 12/19/06 - 03:03

guest, M-F 7-5 western wake's rescue is staffed with fully qualified (aka municipal FF's working P/T), CAD SHOULD be able to make this distinction.

This is why I think our CAD needs to go to "in service" unit dispatch rather than just dispatching trucks. Trucks should only be "in service" if they are staffed with a set minimum of 3 qualified individuals.

On another note Western Wake's rescue/pumper at Station 1 is staffed by 3 people 24/7

but most people know my opinion, and it mirrors Silver's and many others, standardized training before you are allowed to ride, period. That and 'round the clock staffing of every station in the county is the only way that the cities in this county should be getting county pieces. In DC most of those trucks are staffed around the clock by qualified people if I am not mistaken.

**CFP 7021** - 12/19/06 - 07:26

Yes 7021, you are correct. They also use the "in service" unit dispatch, rather than just dispatching units.

**Silver** - 12/19/06 - 10:14

When I was in Anne Arundel County MD several years ago (Company 11...Strong Arm of the Second Battalion) there were several things I noticed-

1. There was a standard for getting on a fire truck. To ride the BRUSH truck, you had to be FFI and EMT-B. To ride the ENGINE, FFII and EMT-B. To ride a RESCUE unit, there were two levels of rescue tech (intermediate and advanced, I think). Bottom line, if you were riding on a piece of apparatus, you were qualified BEFORE you got into it. Plus, unless you had the proper people to staff that piece 24/7, you did not get it.
2. Nearest unit was the standard, regardless of jurisdiction. We ran with Baltimore City units, Baltimore County units, Naval Academy units, and Coast Guard units. Whatever was closest that met the need.
3. A unit was not listed as available in the CAD unless there was a crew on-duty at the station for it.

I think Wake County has reached the point where we need that kind of service.

**DJ** - 12/19/06 - 13:06

you keep talking about qualified, thats great but thre is a difference between certified and qualified. I hope qualified is what you really mean.....most anyone can be certified, experience counts thats where qualified comes in.

**guest** - 12/19/06 - 18:11

You are right...there can be a difference between qualified and certified. Unfortunately, in this day and time, how do you measure 'qualified'? And it is a fact of life that we do have to measure it. And, it has been my experience over the past 10 years or so (out of 31 in emergency services) that the people that have to actually understand the 'measurement' are not trained/educated/experienced professionals. They are personnel and human resource managers, city/town/county managers, and others.

What I am saying is that now we should have a standard of some sort in order to respond on a piece of apparatus. That provides some indication of what the people on that unit should know. In my day and time we did not have that measurement. You were known by the reputation of your department and your department's officers. If they were squared away then you were, too. If they were known as clowns, well, you get the idea. The problem is, how do you verify, or measure, that sort of knowledge and/or ability. That is where certifications were born. Now, I am the first to say that we have people out there who are certified as firefighters or fire officers who could not fight their way out of a burning paper bag. Again, unfortunately, the certification is how we are measured...the reputation comes later.

**DJ** - 12/19/06 - 20:24

I agree with all that has been said. To sum it up I think that wake county needs to go to an in-service cad set up, to ride trucks a level of training needs to be acheived for the minimum number that is needed to staff a truck (Ex. A staffed engine constitutes say 3 people, well those three need to meet say EMT and FFII after those 3 qualified people are riding anyone else with basic training can fill the other spots) and thirdly something has got to change because our main goal is to provide the best, quickest, safest, and most efficient service to the public as possible and that does constitute more cooperation between the City of Raleigh, the towns in wake county and the non municipality stations as well.

**somethinglikeDFD?** - 12/19/06 - 23:07

Name: (real name preferred)  
E-mail: (optional)  
Web Site: (optional)

Remember personal info?

Yes

No

Comment:

/ [Textile](#)

Comment moderation is enabled on this site. This means that your comment will not be visible on this site until it has been approved by an editor.

To prevent spam we require you to answer this silly question

**What are the FIRST TWO LETTERS of the word 'fire'?**

[\(Register your username / Log in\)](#)