

TYNE AND WEAR FIRE AND RESCUE AUTHORITY

MEETING: 16 November 2015

SUBJECT: RESPONSE REVIEW IMPLEMENTATION: PHASE 1 MONITORING

REPORT OF THE CHIEF FIRE OFFICER

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 This report provides an update for Members on the implementation to date of the Integrated Risk Management Planning (IRMP) Review of Operational Response.

2 BACKGROUND

2.1 The IRMP process is the vehicle the Service uses to make significant changes to its shape, ensuring that functions are planned, designed, and delivered in a way that balances available resources and community risk. This is a national process required under the Fire and Rescue National Framework.

2.2 Since 2010, our IRMP actions have been developed against a background of significant reductions in the budget available to the Authority as a result of changes in Government spending.

2.3 Members will recall that during Phase 1 of implementation, two fire appliances were removed from the Service (Swalwell and Wallsend Community Fire Stations), and two appliances being stood down between the hours of 00:00 and 08:59. Phase 2 has seen the introduction of two Targeted Response Vehicles (TRVs) between the hours of 18:00 and 24:00 (20/05/15) and the adoption of the Unwanted Fire Signals Policy and Procedure (01/06/15). Further to this, Phase 2 has seen the replacement of two pumping appliances with Targeted Response Vehicles at Colby Court and Sunderland Central Community Fire Stations. These two TRVs are available twenty four hours a day.

3 MONITORING PROCESS

3.1 The monitoring process for the implementation of the IRMP Review of Operational Response uses analysis of performance data and feedback from crews to identify any impact of the actions taken. The key indicators which have been included in the monitoring process at this stage are:

- Speed of response of first appliance (all incidents)
- Speed of response of second appliance if one was deployed (all incidents)
- Speed of response of first appliance to Risk category 1 and 2 (higher risk) incidents

- Speed of response of first appliance to Risk category 3 and 4 (lower risk) incidents
- Operational assurance- recorded performance issues in affected geographical areas
- Firefighter safety- recorded operational H&S incidents and near misses in affected geographical areas

3.2 Monitoring has taken place at the whole service (across Tyne and Wear) level, and also at the level of the geographical areas affected by the removal of appliances.

3.3 This report highlights performance for the last three months of the implementation period (June to August 2015) comparing this period with the same period in previous years.

4 WHOLE SERVICE IMPACT

Speed of response

4.1 Across Tyne and Wear, the average attendance time of the first appliance to all incident types has increased by 34 seconds when compared to the same period in the previous year. The average attendance time for the first appliance at risk level one incidents has reduced by 5 seconds.

4.2 The average attendance time of the second appliance has increased by 2 seconds in comparison to the same period in the previous year.

Operational performance and firefighter safety

4.3 There are no issues to report regarding operational performance, operational firefighter injuries or near misses across Service area during the monitoring period. No Health and Safety issues have been raised which relate to the implementation of this review.

5 REMOVAL OF APPLIANCE FROM WALLSEND CFS

5.1 The average attendance time for the first appliance in attendance has increased by 36 seconds when compared to the same period in the previous year.

5.2 Of the 162 incidents in the Wallsend area, 40 were classified as risk level one. The average attendance time for the first appliance at these incidents has improved by 4 seconds.

5.3 The average attendance time for the second appliance attending an incident in the Wallsend area has increased by 34 seconds when compared to the previous year. For risk level one incidents in the Wallsend area the Service experienced a decrease in attendance time of the second appliance of 44 seconds.

6 REMOVAL OF APPLIANCE FROM SWALWELL CFS

- 6.1 The average attendance time for the first appliance in the Swalwell area has decreased by 10 seconds in comparison the previous year.
- 6.2 Of the 163 incidents in the Swalwell area, 46 were risk level one. The average attendance time for these incidents has decreased by 41 seconds.
- 6.3 The average attendance time of the second appliance has increased by 16 seconds when compared to the previous year. For risk level one incidents the increase has been an average of 1 minute 26 seconds.
- 6.4 This performance (an average of 9 minutes 42 seconds for the second pump attending incidents), is similar to the levels of performance achieved by the Service's existing one pump fire stations, and is in line with the expectations and planning assumptions of the review.

7 STAND DOWN OF TWO APPLIANCES BETWEEN 00:00 AND 08:59 HRS

- 7.1 TWFRS attended 741 incidents from June to August 2015 between the hours of 00:00 and 08:59 hrs. 179 were risk level one, 66 were risk level two, 318 were risk level three, and 178 were risk level four.
- 7.2 From June to August 2015 the average attendance time of the first appliance in attendance increased by 15 seconds and the average attendance time of the second appliance increased by 26 seconds. For risk level one incidents the average attendance time for the first appliance increased by 13 seconds and the second appliance by 48 seconds.

8 INTRODUCTION OF TWO TRVs FROM 18:00 TO 24:00 HRS

- 8.1 TRVs attended 355 incidents from June to August 2015, the average attendance time for a TRV at an incident for the period was 11 minutes 1 second. The mobilising philosophy for TRVs is that a TRV will be dispatched if it can reach an incident in 12 minutes.
- 8.2 The incident classification type 'fire in the open (small)' accounted for 303 (85%) of TRV incidents.

9 UNWANTED FIRE SIGNALS POLICY AND PROCEDURE

- 9.1 FROM June to August 2015 between the hours of 08:00 and 17:59, TWFRS responded to 182 AFA calls. This is a reduction of 234 compared to the same period of the previous year.
- 9.2 Newcastle saw the greatest reduction of 116 attendances followed by Sunderland with a reduction of 64.

- 9.3 From June to August 2015 87% of mobilisations between 08:00 and 17:59 were to exempted premises. Education, hospitals, and medical care establishments continue to have the highest number of Unwanted Fire Signals.
- 9.4 In relation to non-exempt premises, Unwanted Fire Signal incidents in the worst offending top five premises types have reduced from 180 incidents to just 14, a reduction of 92%.

10 REPLACEMENT OF PUMPING APPLIANCES WITH TRVs

- 10.1 This action was executed on 04/09/15 and as such has not yet attracted sufficient data to allow valid analysis.

11 RISK MANAGEMENT

- 11.1 Community risk has been fully considered in reviewing our operational response, and discussion of this formed a significant proportion of the review report discussed by Authority in October 2013 and January 2014.
- 11.2 Implementation of the Response Review means significant change for the service and a number of the key risks on the corporate risk register apply, in particular:
- 11/02 Risk that further budget cuts will mean that we have to make decisions that will affect the delivery of front line services.
 - 08/28 Failure to effectively and safely deploy and manage operational staff and resources at incidents leading to staff and public being exposed to unnecessary risks
 - 11/01 Risk that we do not realise the savings proposed in our IRMP resulting in reduced financial resilience and potential impact on service delivery.
- 11.3 Clearly we have not been able to mitigate risk 11/02, since our budget has been cut to the extent where the frontline service is affected, despite the Authority's efforts to lobby for smaller and more proportionate reductions in our budget.
- 11.4 Mitigating risk 08/28 is a priority of the implementation process. If the Authority is minded to continue with the high level plan, further reports will be prepared on the monitoring of impact as any phase of the change is implemented.
- 11.5 This is in line with the approach taken when the Authority introduced riding 4 and 4, where reports were brought to Authority monitoring the impact on risk and safety.

12 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

12.1 There are no further financial implications resulting from this report.

13 HR IMPLICATIONS

13.1 Detailed negotiations will continue with the FBU to implement all phases of the high level plan, specifically around the terms and conditions, work location and duties of affected staff.

14 EQUALITY AND FAIRNESS IMPLICATIONS

14.1 There are no equality and fairness implications in respect of this report.

15 HEALTH AND SAFETY IMPLICATIONS

15.1 There are no health and safety implications in respect of this report.

16 RECOMMENDATIONS

16.1 The Authority is recommended to:

- a) Note the interim monitoring update.
- b) Receive further reports as appropriate.

**Tyne and Wear Fire
and Rescue Authority**
Creating the Safest Community

www.twfire.gov.uk

