Tyne and Wear Fire and Rescue Authority
Creating the Safest Community
www.twfire.gov.uk

TYNE AND WEAR FIRE AND RESCUE AUTHORITY   Item No: 8

MEETING: 15th FEBRUARY 2016

SUBJECT: IRMP RESPONSE REPORT

REPORT OF THE CHIEF FIRE OFFICER, CHIEF EXECUTIVE AND CLERK TO THE AUTHORITY

---

1.   PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1   The purpose of this report is to provide an update to members on the impact of the Integrated Risk Management Plan (IRMP) Fire Cover actions on operational response in Tyne and Wear.

2.   INTRODUCTION

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.

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.

2.2   In March 2014 (Min 78 of 2014), Members approved a high level plan which phased the implementation of this review over a 4 year period, this was further updated in February 2015 (Min 64 of 2015).

2.3   The Authority requested reports detailing any impact of the implementation, alongside reports on the financial situation the Service faces. To this end, a detailed monitoring process has been designed which covers the specific actions taken in order to capture any impact on the service provided to the community.

2.4   This report highlights performance for the previous six months of the Implementation plan: July to December 2015 and compares this with the same months in the previous four years. Reference is made to the data from the year one report which covers the first year of the IRMP implementation (July 2014 to June 2015). Therefore this report covers the first 18 months following the implementation of the IRMP actions. Data available for the year

Creating the Safest Community

2 report (July 2014 to June 2016) will allow cumulative reporting.

2.5   Within this report, data relating to attendance time is calculated using appliance 'sent' and 'in attendance' times. This allows changing resources to be more accurately monitored by removing anomalies from 'time of call' to 'send' (e.g. time taken to find incident locations or Control dealing with distressed callers).

2.6   The main actions introduced and the impacts assessed in this report are:

- The removal of G02 on 1st July 2014 (month 1)

- The removal of Y02 on 3rd July 2014 (month 1)

- The stand down of two appliances between the hours of 00:00 to 08:59 hours from 5th January 2015 (month 7)

- The introduction of two Targeted Response Vehicles (TRVs) on 20th May 2015 (month 11)

- The introduction of the Unwanted Fire Signals Policy and Procedure on 1st June 2015 (month 12)

- The introduction of two full-time TRVs on 4th September 2015 (month 15) as replacement appliances for C02 and N02

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)

- peed 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

Creating the Safest Community

- 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 implementation of the review.

4.   IMPACT OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE IRMP REVIEW OF FIRE COVER

4.1   **Service Data**

First appliance attendance

4.1.1   The average attendance time for the first appliance in year one of the IRMP implementation was 5 minutes 22 seconds, an increase of 5 seconds on the previous year.

4.1.2   The average attendance time for the first appliance in attendance during July to December 2015 has increase by 45 seconds to 6 minutes and 5 seconds when compared to the previous year.

4.1.3   However, when the attendance times for the TRVs as first appliance in attendance are removed (the response strategy for TRV is predicated on a slower response to low risk incidents, thus protecting life risk appliances speed of response to higher risk incidents), the overall average attendance time for the Service, during July to December 2015, saw a reduction of 1 second in comparison to the previous year.

4.1.4   The average attendance time to risk level one incidents was 5 minutes and 5 seconds for the first appliance in year one, this is an increase of 1 second when compared to the previous year. Risk level one incidents accounted for 21% (3033) of the total number on incidents.

4.1.5   Comparing July to December 2015 with the same time period in 2013 shows the average attendance time reduced by 1 second. Risk level one incidents accounted for 24% (1665 incidents) of the 7070 incidents during this time period.

Second appliance attendance

Creating the Safest Community

4.1.6   The average attendance time for the second appliance in year one of the IRMP implementation was 6 minutes 12 seconds, an increase of 8 seconds on the previous year.

4.1.7   The average attendance time for the second appliance in attendance during July to December 2015 was 6 minutes and 35 seconds, an increase of 20 seconds in comparison to the same period in the previous year.

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

4.2   **Wallsend (G) Data**

4.2.1   The average attendance time for the first appliance in year one of the IRMP implementation was 5 minutes 24 seconds, an increase of 2 seconds on the previous year. This is comparable to the average attendance times for the whole Service during year one.

4.2.2   During year one risk level one incidents accounted for 23% (129) of the 568 incidents in Wallsend (G) station area. The average attendance time for the first appliance was 4 minutes and 59 seconds, a 15 second decrease on the previous year.

4.2.3   The average attendance time for the first appliance in attendance during July to December 2015 was 5 minutes and 52 seconds, an increase of 36 seconds in comparison to the same period in the previous year. This is lower than the average Service attendance times for the same period (as stated in 4.4 above).

4.2.4   During July to December 2015 when the attendance times for the TRVs as the first appliance are removed, the average attendance time reduces by 2 seconds in comparison to the previous year, showing a similar pattern to the times for the Service as whole. TRVs attended 36 incidents. This equates to 39% of incidents where G01 was not first appliance in attendance.

4.2.5   The average attendance time for the second appliance to all incidents in year one of the IRMP implementation was 6 minutes 48 seconds, an increase of 30 seconds on the previous year.

4.2.6   The average attendance time for the second appliance to all incidents during July to December 2015 was 6 minutes and 54 seconds, an increase of 24 seconds in comparison to the same period in the previous year. Risk level one incidents however saw an improvement in average attendance time for the

Creating the Safest Community

second appliance of 15 seconds.

4.3   Swalwell (Y) Data

4.3.1   The average attendance time for the first appliance in year one of the IRMP implementation was 6 minutes 29 seconds, a decrease of 15 seconds on the previous year.

4.3.2   The average attendance time for the first appliance in attendance during July to December 2015 was 6 minutes and 56 seconds, an increase of 22 seconds in comparison to the same period in the previous year. This is 51 seconds longer than the Service average for the same period. Further work is now underway to examine the type (risk level) of incidents attended in the Chopwell and Swalwell area and the impact the availability of the retained appliance in the Chopwell area has across the Service.

4.3.3   During year one, risk level one incidents accounted for 26% (151) of the 576 incidents in Swalwell (Y) station area. The average attendance time to risk level one incidents for the first appliance was 6 minutes and 21 seconds, a 7 second decrease on the previous year.

4.3.4   However, during July to December 2015, when TRVs are removed as first appliance the average attendance decreased by 2 seconds in comparison to the previous year, following the pattern across the Service as a whole. TRVs attended 31 incidents. This equates to 41% of incidents where Y01 was not first appliance in attendance, C17 attended 28 incidents.

4.3.5   During July to December 2015, risk level one incidents accounted for 96 (30%) incidents and saw an increase in the average attendance time for the first appliance of 16 seconds to 6 minutes and 26 seconds and is comparable to the Service level data. However, when compared with the same time period in 2013 the average attendance time decreased by 12 seconds.

4.3.6   The average attendance time for the second appliance to all incidents in year one of the IRMP implementation was 9 minutes 48 seconds, an increase of 2 minutes and 36 seconds on the previous year.

4.3.7   The average attendance time for the second appliance to all incidents during July to December 2015 was 9 minutes and 47 seconds an increase of 6 seconds in comparison to the same period in the previous year. This is higher than the average times for the Service as a whole.

4.4   Stand Down of Two Appliances Between 00:00 and 08:59

Creating the Safest Community

4.4.1　The average attendance time for the first appliance for this time period in year one of the IRMP implementation was 5 minutes 33 seconds, an increase of 17 seconds on the previous year.

4.4.2　During the hours of 00:00 and 08:59 between July and December 2015, the average attendance time for the first appliance was 6 minutes and 10 seconds, an increase of 38 seconds in comparison to the previous year. Due to the relatively small data set, when the attendance times for the TRVs are removed there is little evidence of any impact on the attendance times for risk level one two and three incidents. However risk level four attendance times have increased by 1 minute and 15 seconds in comparison to the previous year.

4.4.3　During year one the average attendance time to risk level one incidents was 5 minutes and 36 seconds.

4.4.4　During the July to December 2015, risk level one attendance times have increased by 8 seconds to 5 minutes and 35 seconds in comparison to the previous year; this is reflective of the year one data.

4.4.5　The average attendance time for the second appliance to all incidents in year one of the IRMP implementation was 6 minutes 41 seconds, an increase of 25 seconds on the previous year.

4.4.6　The average attendance time for the second appliance to all incidents from July to December 2015 was 6 minutes and 51 seconds, an increase of 27 seconds.

4.5　The Introduction of Two TRVs Between 18:00 and 00:00

4.5.1　The part time TRVs were introduced on 20th May 2015. This section covers the six months from July 2015 to December 2015.

4.5.2　During July to December 2015 the part time TRVs attended a total of 442 incidents (making a total of 625 incidents since their introduction in May).

4.5.3　The average attendance time for the part time TRVs is 10 minutes and 37 seconds. The average time spent at an incident is 13 minutes 57 seconds. This is against the target attendance time for TRVs of 12 minutes.

4.5.4　Of the 442 incidents, 396 (90%) were risk level four incidents. The part time TRVs attended 31% of all risk level four incidents which occurred during the hours of 18:00 and 23:59.

Creating the Safest Community

4.5.5   The part time TRVs attended 298 (67%) incidents within the 12 minute target time, a further 104 (24%) were within 12 to 15 minutes.

4.6   **The Introduction of Two Full Time TRVs**

4.6.1   The full time TRVs were introduced on 4th September 2015. The time frame in this section differs from the rest of the report as it presents data from the 4th of September 2015 until December 2015.

4.6.2   Since the 4th of September 2015 the full time TRVs attended a total of 724 incidents.

4.6.3   The average attendance time for the full time TRVs is 9 minutes and 31 seconds. The average time spent at an incident is 12 minutes 11 seconds.

4.6.4   Of the 724 incidents, 673 (93%) were risk level four incidents. The full time TRVs attended 43% of all risk level four incidents occurring since their introduction.

4.6.5   The full time TRVs attended 543 (75%) incidents within the 12 minute target time, a further 136 (19%) were within 12 to 15 minutes. Further investigation has shown that a number of risk level 4 incidents have been more difficult to locate due to lack of information passed by the caller, and a number of risk level 4 incidents had also been extinguished by a third party before the arrival of the TRV. This will be kept under review.

4.7   **TRV Simultaneous Incidents**

4.7.1   Since the introduction of the TRVs, a category 1 or 2 appliance was able to attend 110 incidents whilst a TRV was dealing with a lower risk level incident in the same station area at the same time.

Creating the Safest Community

4.8 **Newcastle Central (C) Data**

4.8.1 The average attendance time for the first appliance in attendance during September to December 2015 was 4 minutes and 47 seconds, an increase of 21 seconds in comparison to the same period in the previous year.

4.8.2 The data regarding TRVs as the first appliance in attendance within this area is relatively small to date therefore the incident data is reported in full until data from a longer period is available.

4.8.3 During September to December 2015 risk level one accounted for 112 (21%) incidents and saw an increase in average attendance times for the first appliance of 47 seconds to 4 minutes and 58 seconds. This remains below the Service average for the same period.

4.8.4 The average attendance time for the second appliance to all incidents during September to December 2015 was 7 minutes, an increase of 1 minute and 52 seconds in comparison to the same period in the previous year.

4.8.5 Risk level one incidents saw an increase in average attendance time for the second appliance of 1 minute 37 seconds to 6 minutes and 51 seconds.

4.9 **Sunderland Central (N) Data**

4.9.1 The average attendance time for the first appliance in attendance during September to December 2015 was 5 minutes and 21 seconds, a decrease of 1 second in comparison to the same period in the previous year. The data regarding TRVs as the first appliance in attendance within this area is relatively small to date therefore the incident data is reported in full until data from a longer period is available.

4.9.2 During September to December 2015, risk level one incidents accounted for 74 (20%) incidents and saw a decrease in the average attendance time for the first appliance of 23 seconds to 4 minutes and 32 seconds.

4.9.3 The average attendance time for the second appliance to all incidents during September to December 2015 was 7 minutes and 3 seconds an increase of 56 seconds in comparison to the same period in the previous year.

4.10 Unwanted Fire Signals (UWFS) – Adoption Of The Risk Based Attendance Policy (RBAP)

4.10.1 A detailed report on the RBAP was brought before Members in the January 2016 meeting of the Fire Authority (Min 61 of 2016)

4.11 Introduction of Cobra Cold Cutting Equipment

4.11.1 Starting in September 2015 Cobra Cold Cut units have been successfully installed at Washington, West Denton, Sunderland Central, Byker, Tynemouth, South Shields, Rainton Bridge, Colby Court, and Swalwell Community Fire Stations as well as on the Aerial Ladder Platform at Gateshead Community Fire Station.

4.11.2 All crews at these locations have received thorough training and Cobra has now been deployed at a growing number of operational incidents.

5. RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

5.1.1 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.

5.1.2 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.

5.1.3 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.

5.1.4 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

Creating the Safest Community

prepared on the monitoring of impact as any phase of the change is implemented.

5.1.5   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.

5.1.6   To date there have been no reported H&S concerns regarding the changes to date from operational staff

6.   FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

6.1   There are no further financial implications as a result of this report.

7.   HR IMPLICATIONS

7.1   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.

8.   EQUALITY AND FAIRNESS IMPLICATIONS

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

9.   HEALTH AND SAFETY IMPLICATIONS

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

10.   RECOMMENDATIONS

10.1   The Authority is recommended to:

a)   Note the monitoring update on actions taken to date.
b)   Receive further reports as appropriate.