

6. IRMP 2011/12 Fire Cover: Proposals and Results of Consultation

Purpose of report

1. To inform the Policy and Resources Committee of the outcomes of the recent consultation programme, and to consider the recommendations for approval by the Fire and Rescue Authority.

Recommendations

The Chief Fire Officer recommends that:

- i) the 2011/12 IRMP Recommendation 4 Fire Cover Review and feedback from consultation is noted; and***
- ii) approval for the following recommendations is given:***
 - to reduce the number of firefighting staff on each watch at the three existing day crewed fire stations (Malvern, Evesham and Droitwich) from 8 to 7;***
 - to reduce the number of firefighting staff on each watch at Hereford and Worcester fire stations from 14 to 12.5 (average between the two stations);***
 - to implement a new crewing pattern (Day Crewing Plus) at Bromsgrove, leading to a reduction in the establishment from 28 to 14 and;***
 - there are no changes to the provision of the third Retained Duty System (RDS) appliance at Hereford, Worcester and Redditch.***

Introduction and Background

2. As part of the current IRMP 2011/12 Action Plan, Recommendation 4 stated:

'We will review our fire cover and response arrangements', contained within this statement are three elements which were to be reviewed:

1. The current crewing arrangements at Bromsgrove.
2. The requirement of a third appliance at Hereford, Worcester and Redditch.
3. The appropriate number of personnel on each watch at wholetime and day crewed stations.

3. The recommendation to review these areas of fire cover was the subject of consultation for twelve weeks during 2010 and was subsequently approved for review in 2011/12. The review has now been completed and accepted by the Senior Management Board (SMB). The review initially began with an extensive information gathering phase relying not only on statistical data, but historical activity data, anecdotal information, professional judgement and predictive data. Staff and other key stakeholders were consulted during the review and their feedback has been considered. The services of an external company were also utilised to analyse the data and run predictive scenarios.
4. A further eight week period of consultation with the affected internal stakeholders was approved by the Policy and Resources Committee on 7 March 2012. This has now been completed and is included in this report. Appendix A provides details of the consultation program and responses.

Proposals

5. The outcomes of the review identified the following:
 - Bromsgrove is suitable for a new crewing system realising significant cost benefits through a reduction of up to 50% of the current staff at the station, this is without any reduction in fire cover or numbers of crew on the appliance, and maintaining the same response time as now.
 - Removal of a third appliance at Hereford, Worcester and Redditch is not recommended. Whilst there is no clear case for each station to retain three appliances, it is determined that the removal of any Retained Duty System (RDS) appliance from these stations will have wider organisational impacts that will need consideration. These considerations should be balanced against the limited cost benefit of the removal of each appliance.
 - Current staffing numbers at selected wholetime and day crewed stations can be reduced without impact to service delivery.
6. Following the recent eight week period of internal consultation and engagement there are no changes recommended to these proposals.
7. The above outcomes have the potential to provide a saving of approximately £1million, without any direct changes to the service provided to the communities of Herefordshire and Worcestershire. The existing number of appliances and current response times would remain unchanged. These efficiencies would be provided through the employment of less uniformed personnel, with a reduction in the current “establishment” and changes to working practices. It is anticipated that this can be achieved through the loss of existing uniformed staff, through ‘natural turnover’ during the next three years.

Bromsgrove

8. Bromsgrove provides an opportunity for a new type of crewing system due to its low overall levels of call activity. The new proposed system is very similar to the current “day crewed” model used at Malvern, Evesham and Droitwich, which used to be in place at Bromsgrove prior to 1996. The primary difference with the new system is the

manner in which the night cover is delivered. This is provided by rooms on the station for staff to reside in, rather than requiring the staff to live in close proximity to the station and respond from their home during these hours.

9. This has two primary benefits, firstly the response is immediate 24/7 and there is no delay due to responding from home during the night, giving the same response to that which is currently provided in Bromsgrove. Secondly the new system is open to a greater number of staff as there is no requirement to move home into the area. The number of staff required to work this new system, called day crewing plus (DCP), is 50% less than the current wholetime model. The staff receive appropriate additional remuneration for the commitment which will make the system financially attractive to some staff.

Third appliance at Hereford, Worcester and Redditch

10. The review highlighted, through the activity analysis of Redditch, Hereford and Worcester, that the provision of three appliances at each location could not be supported in isolation. However, wider consideration of the overall fire cover benefits across the Service did offer some evidence against this finding, especially in Hereford and Redditch. The report concluded that combined with the wider fire cover considerations, the provision of the third RDS appliance at these locations did offer excellent value for money. Therefore this review does not propose any alteration to this provision. The disestablishment of these existing units (one RDS appliance at each location) would see a loss of 7% of the Service's overall fire cover and only provide a saving in salaries of £120k (approximately).

Staffing Levels

11. Following an extensive review of the current operational staffing levels on fire stations, it was found that a reduction in the numbers of full time employed firefighters can be achieved without affecting the delivery of service to the community.
12. It is proposed that at the day crewed stations (Malvern, Evesham and Droitwich) the number of full time firefighters will reduce from eight to seven per watch, and that Hereford and Worcester stations will reduce from fourteen to twelve and a half posts per watch.
13. This review has highlighted that after any proposed changes were implemented the remaining "establishment" of employed full time uniformed staff would still provide a resilient level of additional staff. This capacity can be used daily for predictable absences, such as leave and training and for unplanned absences, such as sickness. Where further resilience is required due to unplanned or temporary staff shortages, staff can be offered the opportunity to work overtime. This overtime system called the "Resilience Register" has been utilised in this way successfully for a number of years. These proposals have also been calculated on standard crewing of five per first wholetime appliance. Therefore as an additional layer of resilience the Service can reduce this to four per appliance without compromising response protocols, potentially providing up to eight additional members of operational staff across the Service at any given time.

14. This results in a reduction of firefighters at each day crewed station from sixteen to fourteen and from fifty six to fifty at both Hereford and Worcester stations, with an overall total reduction of eighteen firefighter posts.

Supplementary issues identified

15. It was noted that the Redditch model, of one wholetime crewed appliance and two RDS appliances, currently offers high levels of resilience in a cost effective manner to provide a three appliance station. Currently the provision of two crewed appliances at both Hereford and Worcester and a single RDS appliance at each unit is an area where further efficiencies may be realised. With RDS appliances offering little scope for efficiency savings (and thus offering a low cost form of fire cover) there may be an opportunity to identify efficiencies of up to £700,000 per (second) Whole-time appliance at Hereford and Worcester stations, whilst retaining three appliances at each location. However, this would change the speed of response provided to the public whereby only the first appliance would be an immediate response and the further two appliances would be subject to a delay due to response times of RDS staff, as is currently the case at Redditch.
16. This would still provide a response within the current Authority standards and quicker than at many other locations in the two Counties. This report does not recommend any changes to the status of the second appliance at Hereford and Worcester station, however it may be a consideration in the future.

Engagement and consultation

17. Following the completion of the review an engagement and consultation programme of eight weeks has recently been undertaken with internal stakeholders and selected partners in order to provide feedback for final submission to this Committee before the matter is considered by the Fire and Rescue Authority in June 2012. As the changes proposed do not affect the provision of fire cover currently provided to the public, and in accordance with the principles of consultation, (i.e. that consultation should be proportionate to the changes and with those most affected), this consultation and engagement programme was directed at internal staff and other interested parties. Further details and outcomes of the consultation programme 9 March to 4 May 2012 are detailed in Appendix A.
18. From the recent eight week period of consultation there were 34 direct respondents giving approximately eighty key points on the proposed recommendations. Over thirty (approximately 40%) of these key points gave direct support for these proposals, whilst only a few actually directly opposed the proposals. The remaining key points raised the following concerns:
 - Approximately 18% of respondents felt that overall resilience may be compromised with less available employed staff.
 - Less than 10% of respondents felt that these proposals may compromise their ability to take leave or holiday.
 - Less than 10% of respondents felt that the special appliances (not fire appliances) at the various affected stations would have less trained staff and that these proposals may affect their overall availability.

- 3 respondents felt these proposals may compromise firefighter safety, but did not explain why.

19. Regarding specific items, a number of respondents did not believe the proposals for Bromsgrove were family friendly and that the crewing changes at Hereford station were not justified, primarily due to its geographical remoteness.

Potential Efficiencies

20. Table 1: Bromsgrove proposed efficiencies

Description of Cost	Amount
Current system	£1,074,000
DCP fixed costs*	-
	£659,000
Variable Costs	- £0
Total Savings	£415,000

*Note: The figures above for Bromsgrove Day Crewing Plus (DCP) are based on 14 personnel with an enhancement of 20%.

21. Table 2: Proposed efficiencies by reduction in establishments

Station	Post Reductions	Financial Savings
Hereford and Worcester	-12	£435,000
Droitwich, Evesham, Malvern	-6	£247,000
Total net reduction of posts	-18	£682,000

Note: This reduces the day crewed stations establishment levels from 8 to 7 per watch and Hereford and Worcester stations to an average of 12.5 personnel per watch. This combined with the reduction in posts at Bromsgrove would require an overall reduction of 32 operational posts.

Financial Considerations

Consideration	Yes/No	Reference in Report i.e. paragraph no.
There are financial issues that require consideration	Yes	Paragraphs 13 and 14. Future adoption of recommendations will realise potential efficiencies.

Legal Considerations

Consideration	Yes/No	Reference in Report i.e. paragraph no.
There are legal issues e.g. contractual and procurement, reputational issues that require consideration	Yes	Paragraphs 6, 7 and 9. Potential changes to crewing would require new staff contracts.

Additional Considerations

22. The table below sets out any additional issues arising from the proposals contained in this report and identifies the relevant paragraphs in the report where such issues are addressed.

Consideration	Yes/No	Reference in Report i.e. paragraph no.
Resources (e.g. Assets, ICT, Human Resources, Training & Development, Sustainability).	Yes	Entire Report. Media & Communications, Service Delivery, HR, Training and Finance
Strategic Policy Links (e.g. IRMP, Authority Plan, Equality & Diversity, Partnerships, Environmental Impact).	Yes	Entire report – IRMP, Asset Management Strategy.
Risk Management / Health & Safety (e.g. risk management and control measures, risk register score).	Yes	Paragraphs 7 and 9. Limited risk that not enough staff are attracted to operate proposed new shift system. Additional remuneration and conditions should make system attractive.
Consultation with Representative Bodies	Yes	Early engagement with Trade Unions on all proposals.

Conclusion/Summary

23. The recommendations for change within this paper are based upon an extensive and complex review. These proposals offer a large scale efficiency saving with no change in the level of service currently provided to the community. There will be opportunities for some staff to work an alternative new flexible shift pattern at Bromsgrove, alongside those already in place throughout the Service, and be remunerated accordingly. The potential increased use of the resilience register for unplanned deficiencies, rather than the permanent employment of additional staff not only offers a more efficient model of resilience, but will provide those staff who are willing, with an opportunity to earn extra income.
24. The Service is committed to firefighter and community safety, as well as delivering quality services. During this period of austerity where resources are being reduced these proposals aim to ensure that with careful implementation and management, none of these principles are compromised.

Supporting Information

Appendix A: Consultation Programme and Outcomes for the period 9th March to 4th May 2012

Background Papers

Full Review Report

Appendix 1: Review of Fire Cover and Response Arrangements – FRA Report

Contact Officer

Jon Pryce, Area Commander – Corporate Services
(01905 368355)
Email: jpryce@hwfire.org.uk

IRMP Recommendation 4

Review of Fire Cover and Response Arrangements

Consultation Programme and Outcomes From 9th March to 4th May 2012



HEREFORD & WORCESTER
HWFR
FIRE AND RESCUE SERVICE



IRMP 2011/12 Recommendation 4: Fire Cover Review **Consultation**

The Chief Fire Officer recommends that implementation of the following outcomes of the review is taken forward for eight weeks engagement with stakeholders

Fill in your details below, leave your views in the comments boxes and return your form to gboraston@hwfire.org.uk

Name

Surname

Location

Service Number

Proposal 1:

to reduce the establishment on each watch at the three existing day crewed stations (Malvern, Evesham and Droitwich) to 7 from 8

Proposal 2:

reduce the establishment at Hereford and Worcester stations from 14 to 12.5, a combined figure of 28 to 25 per coloured watch

Proposal 3:

implement a new crewing pattern (Day Crewing Plus) at Bromsgrove, leading to a reduction in the establishment from 28 to 14

What next?

If you would like to discuss the proposals further please contact Area Commander Jon Pryce on 01905 368 355 or email jpryce@hwfire.org.uk

This form offers staff an opportunity to respond officially to any of the proposals as outlined above. Please could you return this form to:

Gemma Boraston – Performance & Information

Hereford & Worcester Fire and Rescue Authority, Service Headquarters, 2 Kings Court, Charles Hastings Way, Worcester, WR5 1JR. Tel: 01905 368 318

This document can also be returned electronically via: gboraston@hwfire.org.uk

Closing date for receipt of ALL returns is 4th May 2012

Eight Week Internal Consultation Programme following P&R Committee Approval on 7th March 2012.

1. Background

This report highlights the proposed consultation programme for Recommendation 4 which states: *'we will review our fire cover and response arrangements'*. Recommendation 4 reviewed the following:

1. The current crewing arrangements at Bromsgrove.
2. The requirement of a third Appliance at Hereford, Worcester and Redditch.
3. The appropriate number of personnel on each watch at Whole-time and Day Crewed stations.

In considering the three elements above, there are a proposed a range of options for change. In compiling Recommendation 4 key objectives were:

1. To deliver a range of proposals that are balanced and proportionate.
2. To deliver a range of options that would not compromise operational standards or safety.

Proposals within Recommendation 4 will primarily only affect internal stakeholders, based upon this the consultation audience is internal staff.

2. Objectives of our consultation

In line with the principles of consultation based upon proportionality it is proposed that the duration of the consultation programme will be 8 weeks. The programme will begin on March 9th 2012 and conclude on May 4th 2012.

This duration and programme has been determined by the following:

1. Extensive information gathering exercises have already been conducted with affected stakeholders prior to and during the formulation of the Recommendation 4 review.
2. The relevant information will be published and direct contact will be programmed for those groups affected in order to document their feedback. (See Consultation Programme of Visits).
3. Whilst partners and other interested groups will be consulted, a wider program of broad public consultation is not proposed as the outcomes of this review do not change the provision of service to the community, in either response times or numbers of fire appliances.

Our consultation objectives were:

- To offer the opportunity to those most affected to share their views regarding the recommendations proposed and to offer the opportunity for discussion.
- To listen and record both positive views and concerns, as well as understand how the impact of these changes is perceived.
- To provide the facts and context to the proposed changes.

3. How we engaged

The table below outlines our engagement strategy for all groups. The intent is to make the consultation effective by creating environments where views can be expressed. A summary of our target groups can be seen below.

Group	Method of engagement
Staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Visits to all affected stations.• Attendance at command and managerial forums and meetings• Attendance at RDS forums• Provide access to key staff for discussions and “round table” meetings where necessary.
Public	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Promulgation through media to highlight proposals as it is likely that these will be reported post Committee and publishing on information on website.
Partners	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Statutory partners will be made aware of our proposals through existing networks.
Representative Bodies	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• A full programme of engagement will be conducted with representative bodies regarding these proposals.
Media	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Proactive engagement with media (See below)

4. Media coverage

The Service focussed on three key messages in this consultation exercise, which are:

1. No changes to the existing provision of fire cover to the public
2. Reduced cost to the public purse
3. No redundancies as a result of these changes

The purpose of proactive engagement with the media is to ensure the facts are presented and information is available to those who are concerned. By adopting this strategy the Service can assist by presenting the facts.

Consultation Programme

The following highlights the detail behind our consultation programme.

Stakeholders	Date of face to face meetings	Communication Methods					Responded
		Email	Letters	Telephone	Website	Press and Media	
Whole-time Stations:							
<u>Worcester FS</u> White Red Green Blue	13 March, 4.00pm 17 April, 4.00pm 17 April, 6.30pm 10 March, 10.00am	√ - 08/03/12					Yes Yes
<u>Hereford FS</u> White Red Green Blue	22 March, 6.30pm 22 March, 4.00pm 2 April, 2.30pm 26 March, 10.30am	√ - 08/03/12					Yes Yes Yes Yes
<u>Bromsgrove FS</u> White Red Green Blue	15 March, 6.30pm 15 March, 4.00pm 18 April, 10.30am 20 April, 11.00am	√ - 08/03/12					
Day Crewed Stations:							
<u>Malvern FS</u> Green White	26 April, 10.30am 13 April, 10.30am	√ - 08/03/12					Yes
<u>Droitwich FS</u> Green White	16 March, 2.30pm 20 March, 11.00am	√ - 08/03/12					Yes
<u>Evesham FS</u> Green White	19 April, 10.30am 28 March, 2.00pm	√ - 08/03/12					Yes
Retained	18 April	√ - 08/03/12					
Station Commanders Forum	16 April	√ - 08/03/12					
Watch Commanders Forum	8 March, 11.15am 12 March, 11.15am						
Open Forum	18 th April, 2.00pm						
MPs			√ - 08/03/12				

Stakeholder comments from eight week consultation program between 9th March to 4th May 2012.

Recommendation 1

To reduce the establishment on each watch at the three existing day crewed stations (Malvern, Evesham and Droitwich) from 8 to 7

Comments and suggestions

- No real surprise here, the effect will be minimal on performance but may have a cost associated to utilising the resilience register during peak leave periods or following sickness. Resilience will be the only casualty from this change.
- A good idea, primarily the stations are not that busy, the only problem you may have would be to allow the rest of the watch to get their annual leave in, here I'm guessing the resilience would be used, again less than a firefighter would cost if employed.
- I support the standardisation of watch strengths.
- Surely this will lead to increased chances of firefighters getting hurt or injured.
- Any cuts should be made through natural wastage and not redundancies.
- Will there be any impact on leave? Could increase the cost of running the resilience register. Understandable for cost cutting.
- I don't agree with any cuts in Operational Staff especially as our Day Crewing Stations have so many specialist skills and maybe subject to protracted working during spate conditions. The extra person helps with crew rotation during such times to alleviate fatigue and supports Health & Safety.
- Consideration is needed around how mobilising rules will be changed for specialist vehicles at these stations should crews already be in attendance at an incident. Will these stations have to have a minimum crewing number of 5 or can they reduce to 4, if so what safe systems of work are being considered for the first pump in attendance with a reduced crew. Are there any changes in the working hours and standby arrangements at these Stations, and does this take into consideration detached firefighters?
- I feel that this proposal is the right thing to do in the current financial climate
- 7 is not enough bearing in mind leave, sickness and courses. With 7 on duty we are constantly getting detachments in to cover as 5 is the minimum rider factor
- I would accept that this is in line with one pump shift stations and therefore would be an efficiency saving that would not compromise firefighter safety in terms of riders.
- Reduction in establishment may well sufficiently serve our operational response, but will adversely affect our ability to organise training courses, as currently trying to arrange courses around global crewing is difficult enough. There will have to be an acceptance that the resilience register will have to be involved to facilitate training requirements
- Agree with this proposal, with the other 1 pump Whole-time Stations working with a watch of 7, no reason why this can't work for day crewed Stations.
- Seems a sensible way forward as every other watch in the service area is based on 7.
- Would this have an impact on having to detach more from Station 46? Many endeavour to complete the whole shift say Stations are not on minimum rider numbers for long. For example if I go to Evesham I have to leave at 7am and do not return until 19:30 if I am lucky.
- Effective way of making savings and not inducing redundancies.
- This may affect the number of personnel I can have detached from their station from training as this will reduce the global crewing, however if we are smarter than we

currently are with allocating leave to Station Personnel, I feel this could be overcome. We could also look at differing methods of Training delivery for whole time personnel

- Having never worked this duty system I cannot comment on this proposal.
- I appreciate why this is being done however I was just wondering how you would decide who is moving and where they might be moving too?
- No problem, however would like to understand how this affects our leave? Also would want to know what process would be used work out who would be surplus to station and how personnel will be moved.
- Eight on a watch on these day crewed stations is extremely important, due to the amount of special appliances on Station. Some of these specials are only crewed by Whole-time as the RDS are not trained on them. Any cuts to front line posts, puts the public and the firefighters at greater risk from fire. Ever since IRMPs have been used, CFOs across the country have used it as an excuse to slash fire cover.
- Will this not impact on other Stations i.e. Hereford, Worcester having to send out more detachments when these stations have long term sickness/temp promotion etc.
- I fully support this recommendation; this model works elsewhere so I see this as a proactive step.
- I feel it will be a detriment to the overall resilience of the service to reduce the establishment on these stations due to both there specialist roles and the flexibility that day crewing gives the service. The water capability may be reduced or off the run due to lack of crewing.
- By removing personnel from crewing systems, we are reducing the resilience available on a day to day basis, and would be less able to cope with unexpected absences, such as sickness, maternity and paternity leave etc. The fall-back position would I suspect be the resilience register, which would be used to compensate for a lower establishment. So, as expected, the resilience register has become a tool to reduce frontline posts, which we were assured it would not be.
- Personally I cannot see an argument against this, as it brings all one pump stations into line.

Recommendation 2

Reduce the establishment at Hereford and Worcester stations from 14 to 12.5, a combined figure of 28 to 25 per coloured watch

Comments and suggestions

- Unable to comment based on my role being more aligned to proposal 1. I can only reiterate the comments from proposal 1 are equally pertinent here.
- Again this makes sense, especially now if AFAs are to be reduced from April
- I would suggest that due to the location of Hereford Watch here should be maintained at 13 with 12 at Worcester due to the additional support that Worcester has from surrounding Stations. Further the cost of detaching in to Hereford
- Surely this will lead to increased chances of firefighters getting hurt or injured. We have more specials at Hereford than anywhere else and need the current Watch levels to maintain our skills. Station 46 is geographically isolated and needs the maximum number on each Watch to provide adequate fire cover for the tax payers of our county
- Which Station gets the 13 per Watch and which gets the 12? Hereford is isolated and has more specialist equipment than Worcester. Are there plans to stagger the crewing, so for example, 2 watches have 12 and 2 have 13 on each station?
- Any reduction in crewing needs to be considered with a review of the leave policy and the systems used by Training Centre to manage the numbers allocated to courses. Due to the specialist appliances at Hereford, limited time is available when opportunities allow staff to conduct driver training on these specials. A reduction in staffing will

reduce these opportunities further and so the service needs to consider other avenues to prevent these skills from fading.

- Crewing levels need to be kept as high as possible at these stations and in particular Hereford. Hereford station crews have been used for cover when crewing allows for the surrounding retained Stations; this has been successful and is being looked into becoming a more common occurrence. Hereford has strategically located specialist appliances that require crewing and training on, the current crewing allows us to detach crews for training and to crew these assets. Herefordshire Council pay a large percentage towards the running of the Fire Authority and deserve to have their own Whole-time Station crewed to a reasonable standard.
- I realise that cost cutting must take place in these current financial times. If as it seems the Service has to make crewing level reductions at Station 21 and 46, I believe we must give due consideration to Station 46 having 13 on each watch. The reasoning's behind this suggestion would be the geographical location of Station 46, combined with the support it provides to its many surrounding retained stations, for example the crewing of retained appliances to cover shortfalls in retained station crewing. Hereford Station also has a greater number of special appliances that although are not primary crewed, do require a greater resilience of suitably trained staff to utilise them.
- Agree - consideration should be given to the geographic isolation of Hereford and the more diverse vehicles/equipment/specialist roles. The higher number (point fives) of personnel should be posted at Hereford, over Worcester.
- Again understandable cost cutting and at least not reducing fire appliances or redundancies.
- I believe these two stations are overstaffed and support this move. With the introduction of the new AFA policy, incident figures will drastically reduce thus highlighting a true annual turnout and essentially support the need to reduce staff. I'd even consider going further. The smaller watches may also prove easier to manage.
- The second pump at Hereford would be better crewed as a day crewed pump based on the number of incidents, it could also be designated as an RTC specialist vehicle due to the number of RTC's on Hereford roads. Is there a minimum crewing change and if so does this consider the extra burden on the resilience register. If the leave policy rostered and fixed leave so that it ensure that numbers on pumps are spread out more evenly over the year the year the resilience register would not need to be evoked as much and would support the reduced numbers.
- I do not agree with this proposal as I feel it is unworkable and the savings made are minimal
- Training is a big issue regarding specialist equipment. Every shift at present requires at least 2 or 3 personnel to make up the crewing which is made up from detachments or resilience and then the competences are down which effects the readiness
- Agree, if all training can be delivered in an alternative way, such as one pump on delayed turn out i.e. BA training, this would free up the required slots to leave 9 on duty and enough capacity for annual and flexi leave.
- Again a sensible proposal considering the second appliance from each station can crew 4 as opposed to 5. Concern about the location of the 0.5. (would each station share the additional person on rotation, would this fit into annual leave arrangements?).
- I do not believe we should reduce crewing levels at Hereford as the station has a large turnout area. As well as crewing numerous special appliances having a good establishment gives us resilience to allow for relief crews for these appliances and also keep fire appliances on the run
- Reasonable measure to make savings without reducing the service to the public.
- This may affect the number of personnel I can have detached from their station from training as this will reduce the global crewing, however if we are smarter than we currently are with allocating leave to Station Personnel, I feel this could be overcome. We could also look at differing methods of training delivery for whole time personnel

- As a Watch Commander at Worcester I would like to have known if the plan was to put 12 at Worcester and 13 at Hereford or vice versa, looking at the special appliances and location of each station it would be sensible to have 12 at Station 21 and 13 at Station 46
- Is this going to be achieved through natural wastage if so what sort of date do we think this will be achieved?
- This will be the third cut in 8 years to these Stations, from 18 down to the proposed level of 12.5. This is virtually a third of a Watch strength, this will effect resilience across the Service, less people on watches, but an ever increasing workload
- Surely somewhere like Hereford with no Whole-time back up and its amount of appliances need a Station watch complement of 13 and not 12. Worcester have nearby Whole-time cover
- This proposal seems to be creating some confusion, I agree with the reduced numbers, this has worked in other Service areas, but it may have been better to settle on a whole number per Watch, even if that were different between the Watches. The reduced crewing margins will lessen the numbers available for training courses but TDC aim to train as many people at their home station or on delayed turnout as possible.
- I feel this will be a detriment to the service and will affect the resilience of the service. The more positions we lose the less chance we have of coping in spate conditions etc.
- Concerns about resilience
- I believe that if this has to be implemented as explained, then the crewing should be 13 at Station 46 and 12 at Station 21 for the following reasons: 1) 46 provides Whole-time support to retained stations around Herefordshire as the only Whole-time station in Herefordshire. 2) 46 is located in terms of location from other Whole-time stations and therefore is reliant on retained backup. 3) 46 has a large number of special appliances which we need to crew. Reducing the establishment would limit the availability of these appliances. 4) 46 can currently provide personnel to cover retained deficiencies on a day to day basis if necessary. 5) 21 has Whole-time backup and therefore using the above reasoning they are more able to cope with a lower establishment
- Having read the FRA Policy and Resources Committee Report for Recommendation 4, it mentions a few times when talking about lowering the Services required establishment figure about the 'services spare capacity'. By reducing the Services Whole-time establishment by 18 at stations 21, 26, 28, 41 and 46 would reduce every day shift by 6. This would equate to 4 off the run and 2 on planned or unplanned leave. We can see from my figures that there is not the spare capacity to reduce the Whole-time establishment by 18 personnel from Worcester, Hereford, Droitwich, Evesham and Malvern. These figures are assuming the reduction in staff at Bromsgrove will have enough personnel on duty from its establishment figures.
- Having worked at Worcester on and off for the last 24 years and seen the City grow to almost be half as big again, I cannot see the sense in reducing numbers to such an extent, that it would put firefighter safety i.e. crewing 4 and 4, at risk.

Recommendation 3

Implement a new crewing pattern (Day Crewing Plus) at Bromsgrove, leading to a reduction in the establishment from 28 to 14

Comments and suggestions

- I feel unable to comment on a piece of work that I have not been involved with at any time. I assume that a rigorous piece of investigative work has been carried out to ensure that we meet our statutory obligations following this change.

- Fully support the adoption of this crewing model at stations with low activity and low levels of night time risk.
- Is this family friendly?
- Day-crewing plus seems to be a shift system that reduces costs for the service and keeps the cover for the station ground, a system that may become the norm in the future.
- Has due consideration been given to the difficulty in attracting the required number of personnel to Station 25 to facilitate this new crewing model? I believe this model has worked in other Brigades across the country, with the majority of its workforce using the increase in wage as a way to enhance their final salary pension fund. As you are aware the post 2015 pension scheme is a career average one. Following some simple calculations I have discovered that an individual with 20 years' service remaining who works at Station 25 on the day crewing plus system for 5 years of those 20 years would only enhance their pension by approximately £40pcm. I therefore believe that the day crewing plus would become less attractive to fire fighters in the future, resulting in a difficulty in attracting individuals to the proposed shift system.
- Agree - this is a very cost efficient Whole-time crewing system whilst still maintaining the same level of public service.
- Feel that it is not as family friendly as what we have now. With self-roistering it could create issues between staff.
- Again I support this move especially as I am inherently in support of the Day Crew system. I am aware that this has a slight variation but should prove good value for money.
- Does this have an impact on 13/16 arrangements with West Midlands covering Frankley and Rubery? particularly delayed turn out at night, also does the CFS strategy take into consideration this change, strategically what impact will this have on Redditch cover?
- I believe that this proposal is the right choice due to the range and amount of calls received at this station
- Any reduction in firefighter post is strongly opposed, the system itself sounds workable and may suit the younger or single person
- Due to the lack of information about this proposal at this time I do not feel I have enough information to comment.
- With the small number of incidents the station attend likely to be reduced further with the introduction of the new unwanted fire signal policy it's hard to justify a 4 watch system. I agree that a new shift system should be introduced at Bromsgrove, but until the details is released on how the new system would work I feel that I am unable to comment on that
- A sensible proposal as the Service to the public is maintained at the same standard. Would reducing staff in this way affect the resilience register? i.e. much less staff available. This would be compounded if the duty system were to be used at other stations in the future
- I do not have enough information to comment on the impact of this
- I believe it would be much more manageable and less impact on crews to have a 2 Watch day crewed plus system, i.e. 2 watches of 7 crew members with a Watch Commander in charge of each watch. This system would be a lot more manageable then the self-roistering 1 watch of 14 personnel system
- Positive move to accommodate the needs of the local community.
- This will not affect our training delivery as we are moving from 4 to 2 Watches, not reducing the numbers on Watches; in fact this will increase our ability to deliver training to these personnel as we will have more contact time with these personnel e.g. 4 days instead of 2 days and 2 nights.

- Although I don't think this duty system would suit me, it would have been nice to know if the financial benefits were pensionable, what the core hours were going to be and if the appliance was going to be used for secondary fires outside of their core hours
- If this turns out to be an effective way of managing this station is it likely that this type of crewing might be adopted by other stations?
- Not attractive for me. Would want to avoid this!
- This is a disgrace, taking the Fire Service back decades to when firefighters had to live on Fire Stations. The Service is telling the public fire cover will not be affected, that is simply untrue, and the 14 personnel will be doing double the amount of hours, how safe is this? Living on a fire station for 4 days is hardly family friendly. How will the Service staff Bromsgrove if there are no volunteers from whole time staff?
- After 2015 have the service thought about the fact that the 20% on offer to do this crewing pattern would not seem attractive to most people as a career average option. Also it is not family friendly.
- Once again, the Service needs to get the best value for money so on low activity Stations a different balance has to be made, this new crewing model I feel is very appropriate, and crews will actually appreciate attending more incidents as well as the valuable experience that comes with it.
- Again we are losing the resilience within the service and will end up relying on the resilience register to cover short falls in the establishment. What will the service do in the future if the resilience register was removed?
- Agree, but concerned about the existing staff that do not want to work the new system, will the moves be compulsory?
- I believe that in the short term crewing would be achieved, however in the longer term crewing this system may be problematic. I also believe that the financial reward offered is insufficient for the level of increase in commitment expected from firefighters.
- I do not know much of this crewing principle, but hear that it works in other Brigades. However, I am astounded at the rumoured carrot dangle of an extra 20% in this financial climate, where I feel that the brigade would have been far better placed than to test the water and negotiate a deal for anyone interested.