

APPENDIX 2

Draft Community Risk Management 2014-2020

Notes on CRMP Options

Option 1

Pros	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The two pump DCP model (at Hereford fire station) provides immediate 24-7 response in the same way two WT appliances do now. Due to the imminent capital works on the new fire station at Hereford, the new build could be easily adapted to provide the infrastructure required for DCP, although at additional expense.
Cons	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The two pump DCP model is unproven on a multi appliance WT fire station, including in Services that have been operating DCP for a lot longer than we have.• Our experience at Bromsgrove fire station shows the model does not suit everybody and is a voluntary crewing system. Staff may opt out of DCP at any time and due to the Working Time Regulations the Service could not compel them to continue to work extended DCP shifts. Staff are required to often work up to 15 x 24hr shifts per month (excluding leave), of which some shifts may be consecutive.• DCP requires approx. 50% of the existing staff and with the pay enhancement does not make a particularly large revenue savings.• The FBU do not nationally support DCP and there is no collective agreement on this shift system.• This is disproportionate to the findings in the FCR which identifies that risk and call volume demonstrate the Service can provide adequate cover without the second wholetime appliance.• During busy periods, DCP crews cannot be re-used and have lower levels of resilience than shifts that rotate with fresh staff each day.• DCP relies on a very significant culture shift towards self rostering and flexibility in working patterns and practices, that many staff may not be willing to adopt.

Option 2

Pros	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• An enhanced level of immediate response compared to the original CRMP proposal.• The shift system for the Day Duty fire engine could be within current terms and conditions and therefore relatively easy and swift to implement.• These shifts could be structured with some flexibility and could provide cover over peak periods.• These shifts may suit many staff as it is essentially day working (without a night shift), with a similar shift pattern to that currently worked.• Surplus staff above minimum crewing during these periods could continue to support RDS fire stations during the daytime when RDS cover is often at its lowest in some isolated areas.• There are no additional payments or enhancement costs.• There are no additional capital infrastructure build costs.• Off duty staff may be available for additional resilience duties, recall and shifts during peak periods.
Cons	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• This proposal increases the level of provision at Worcester and Hereford fire stations over and above the original proposal as recommend in the CRMP.• This proposal subsequently removes posts from all other WT/DC and DCP fire stations and effectively reduces standard crewing to 4 (from 5) on the remaining one appliance wholetime fire stations.

Option 3

Pros	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Similar to Option 2 in relation to immediate response.
Cons	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Similar to Option 1 in relation to a greater degree of DCP at multiple fire stations, which will have an impact on the Service's resilience and flexibility. Other points around the ability to recruit and high capital costs are also relevant here as a negative. Also noteworthy is the higher number of posts removed for less of a saving.

Option 4

Pros	
Cons	On a professional level, if cover was to be different, the data and professional opinion would suggest that it should be weighted in favour of Worcester fire station not Hereford (i.e. Option 5).

Option 5

Pros	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• DCP could be incorporated into the new build at Worcester fire station.
Cons	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Operating DCP as opposed to DD for the second fire engine is a marginal gain (assuming retained cover of the 2nd fire engine outside of the 12hrs) in comparison to the costs and compromises already discussed (resilience, contracts, volunteers, etc.)