**Further Responses**

Below are further comments that we received, but that we are not able to provide responses to.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Staff</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 1</strong> The approach to the review is logical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will focus on risk and need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Profile should be taken into account since this can act as a predictor for likelihood of future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>But all question’s posessed shoulnl be relivant and sensible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bnn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 2</strong> The review should seek to balance risk and number of incidents with fire cover provision across different areas (please choose one option)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This question is too ambiguous to answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 3</strong> - Although savings from all support functions are still being sought, we need to make savings from this review as a contribution towards the overall savings of £2.5m required by the Service. The current level of fire provision needs to change in order to achieve this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>But not to the detriment of the public who help pay for the service we provide for them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The aim of the review should be to seek the appropriate level of cover and not be a cost saving exercise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the review should be undertaken with a view that future fire cover could go up or down and should not be used as a tool to cut fire cover and save the 2.5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 4</strong> The response times of all appliances to an incident are important; however the attendance time of the first appliance has the most impact on an incident. As an example, it is better for the public to have one appliance arrive at an incident in 8 minutes and the second in 12 minutes than have two arrive together in 10 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The sooner you can get a crew there the better, they can start to set up a plan of action &amp; get following crews to work quicker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best for one to arrive in 8 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 5</strong> Current crewing is still largely based on pumps being crewed by one duty system. If we are looking to balance risk and resource we should consider mixing duty systems on pumps in certain stations (please choose one option)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’ve heard discussed mixing duty systems on stations - eg 1st pump W/T, 2nd day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 6</strong> Other F&amp;RSs are considering using smaller response vehicles. NYFRS should consider a range of response vehicles as part of the review (please choose one option)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 7</strong> Other F&amp;RSs are using new firefighting technology, such as high pressure water lances to deal with compartment fires. NYFRS should consider this as part of the review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although I agree in trying these new technology I do think there will be few occasions that this could be
effective on the fire ground, and a balance between cost and effectiveness would have to be looked at
Although I agree, the amount of incidents that this technology could be used at would be very limited
and may not be cost effective

7. I fully agree that new fire-fighter technologies should be trialled and budgets applied for to do this. If
the government want a new modern fire service Pay for it!

NYFRS should review such technology but I am not convinced that new technology allows for reduced
fire cover and the introduction of the newest technology will tend to be pricey!

Consideration should be given as to whether competence in new techniques can be maintained due to
the infrequency of operational incidents compared with other FRS.

some duty systems are unable to maintain their competences to a high standard now, never mind
introducing new pumping equipment

The training implications and expense for the training for this would be enormous. As would be the
initial purchase cost. Given the number of compartment fires in North Yorkshire this cost could not be
justified.Hidden costs of training/staff turnover should always be taken into account

I can't see the catch in this question... does the said HP lance come on the back of a CSV?

We don't ever seem to be allowed to fight fires due to knee jerk reactions and health and safety. Plus
you say that fires have reduced by 30% so is there any real need.

Consideration to impact on workload to adjust PDAs already set up in VISION

8. We have up to 46 pumps available within 5 minutes, but some appliances are difficult to
crew. It would be better to have some of these appliances with guaranteed availability but with
a longer turn in time to support large incidents or spate conditions

so we rarely have 46 pumps available in 5 minutes. Interesting that you use the broader spate/ large
scale incident in this question but the basic bread & butter issue of FRS cover in our market towns is
omitted!

It depends on what turnout time you are considering? You may be considering 30 - 45 mins or more
which would be totally wrong.

What time are you talking about 30-45 mins or more, this would be totally wrong!

Guaranteed availabiltiy with longer turn in time Mixed duty system to cover

These appliances are intended to provide cover in the area they serve. Extending attendance times
reduces the effectiveness of the fire cover but clearly a longer attendance time is better than non-
availability.

Did the Retained review highlight these issues and were they impleminted I agree, but resources and
staff need to be updated and retrained to work in current incident risk types which are more protracted
and specialized

I agree but there should be a very limited amount of these delayed appliances and only if there is a
proven case they cannot be crewed

Response times can be set in VISION either generically per station or individually by appliance. When
crews pass availability details to Control a "delayed turnout" time could

This may be a situation where a smaller pump with reduced crew could be able to provide

It would be better to have additional pumps for these circumstances not reduced everyday cover.

I think if you made a pledge to pay time and a half for all overtime, you would have no problem
keeping pumps on the run.

9. Crewing should vary according to the incident profile
This option would offer the most efficient business model

a crew of 3 could deal with a bin fire or minor incidents

Equipment carried should vary according to incident profile, this will hopefully inform what resources are required.

We do not always need five personnel at all incidents

Not sure about that sometimes you think you can be ok with 4 but any extra crew members are rarely stood idle

Due to the type of incidents larger crews are require for a greater command and control. EG Swift water.

By 'incident profile' I take it you mean 'incident type'. Remember a fatal incident in Jennyfields, Harrogate a few years back came in as a 'bin fire'. Sending 2 FFs in a van to 'bin fires' will be fine 99% of the time. When their nearest proper fire appliance is 15 minutes away, that 1% won't be fine.

The crewing of an appliance should not change depending on the incident profile as it is always possible that the appliance will receive a further fire call or be re-directed after the incident they are attending has been dealt with. They could be then left in a situation without enough crew to deal with the new incident safely or effectively

Incidents can and often escalate very quickly, and to have access to personnel at short notice would limit incidents damage/extent, saving money in the long run.

Incidents can escalate very quickly, to have additional crew at hand if needed would be more effective than having an incident escalate out of control costing far more in both money and damage in the long run

Not at all you need a crew of ideally 5 for most incidents, especially when you are in

That could have serious Health and Safety implications. All possible incidents need to be considered against the minimum requirements under our SOP's and Safe Systems of work

Incidents happen randomly at any times and not having pumps available because data says they don't happen is going to result in delays in appliances attending.

There should be the optimum number of crew for the safe handling for an incident rather than risking sending the minimum

Difficult to say, an AFA may be a fire even when call challenging has been used

Crewing should only vary between 4 and 6 on a pump. Never less. I've ticked disagree as I know the question is really meaning less than the minimum number of 4 on a crew. All these questions are badly worded and loaded to get the answers you want. If the profile says afa it doesn't mean it is either sensible or safe to send someone in a van

What does incident profile mean?

Further clarification required on what this means

10. As a general principle, where savings have to be made from operational resources, it is better to change crewing arrangements than to remove pumps, and better to remove pumps than to close fire stations

11. Are there any specific factors we should take account of during the review?

As you have already identified, a FRS' work is not all about fire incidents, but sparsely populated areas still suffer from freak weather conditions and often road traffic collisions. Think you know this though!
The climate is changing and the weather will be becoming significantly more extreme over the coming years. Warming will see wetter winters, increasing flood risks, and drier summers, resulting in higher chance of wildfire and the like. As such, I think it imperative there is a proactive position taken to deal with this changing demand on capabilities so that NYFRS is prepared for them in advance rather than scrambling to catch up. In particular, the introduction of smaller, specialised vehicles for dealing with this incidents needs particular attention.

Spate, major incidents

Efficiency is being compromised within the Service through a promotion system that allows availability of some crews in remote stations. Response vehicles to reflect risk in that area.

If current response arrangements remain applicable e.g. all front line appliances having Hazardous material capability, use of 13.5m ladders, radiation equipment etc.

The broader cost to the economy caused by untimely deaths - particularly of children or working adults - or the feasibility of merging Ambulance services with Fire & Rescue. Plus the other issues/ factors I've mentioned above.

We should consider the current national and international financial problems and remind ourselves that figures show that a large and increasing number of people are living in poverty in our communities and that fire deaths are still happening. Also due to the type of county that North Yorkshire is there is an increasing number of visitors holidaying each and every year and the population of many towns will easily double as people holiday there. This will only increase as less people become able to afford foreign holidays.

Need for holistic approach, whilst not losing sight of local variations. V15=Not convinced mini fire engines are the answer to our problems. A bold and robust policy for reduced crewing achieves the same fix whilst maintaining the flexibility and resilience of a consistent fleet. (Good business model from budget airlines on maintaining consistent fleet with benefits including; reduction in training requirements, improved resilience and improved bargaining power for procurement).

There is an indication (from previous DCFO) that an Area Manager post will be lost in the future. I would question this and maybe look at reducing a non uniformed position and join the directorate with another service or consultancy when needed?

Moving some of the older stations the better positions thus the spread the cover. i.e. Ripon and Northallerton the benefit cover in and around Thirsk area.

We need to provide more support to RDS with the use of WT staff. RDS staff struggle to maintain there skills and maintain our systems in the allocated drill periods. WT should be used to organise and run the RDS drill nights and be available to support crewing shortfalls at key locations. This could be provided with the redeployment of WT resources from some of there current locations. This could provide an opportunity to review the number of Flexi Officers.

Officers flexi retained fee instead pay for each call out.

More effective of the current available appliances. Use WT shift more and Day crew / retained less.

The make up of the district with regards to the nearest wholetime pump. Regardless of what we state, the retained can not complete the required training in a 2 hour drill night and the support of a wholetime pump would improve resilience and safety at an incident.

Just using Summerbridge as an example- They have had to recruit FF's from a larger turnout area in order to get the wagon on the run, and they are still off the run daily. They are lucky to be mobile incident in 7 to 10 minutes. Whilst this is better than not at all, you need to factor in that 'any' retained station could develop this problem at some point, so can not be completely relied upon.

The turn out times for each station to get an accurate picture of what the public would be getting in the event of an emergency.

Increasing housing stock increasing risk.
The reduction of staff/pumps/stations may have a detrimental affect on

In more rural areas you can be waiting for some time for the second appliance and the first crew will have alot to deal with until further resources arrive

12. Have you any other suggestions that we should consider in the review?

A 5 man crew fitting smoke alarms in the community is not a wasted resource. The alternative seems to be employing 1-2 man in a van while the W/T sits idle, not meeting the public, not maintaining local topographical knowledge and not gaining familiarity with the houses in our station area. It might sound good in a letter in the Daily Mail but it’s plain silly, really.

Amount of Incidents in some Wholetime Stations and viability of having full time crews

There are a lot of w/t or d/c ffs who are not operational due to medical issues - put them to work in an office, hq or supplies to reduce admin staff

Before final decisions are made the service should ensure that the public know exactly what work the service does

13. Are the any particular groups or sections of the community that we should consider when undertaking the review?

The elderly and vulnerable

Vulnerable people in remote areas

The rural nature of some areas means the smaller communities could suffer poor cover, often these areas suffer with poor supplies of water for attending crews, often making the initial response vital

The large and increasing number of people living in poverty in North Yorkshire. The large and increasing number of people who are elderly and move to North Yorkshire to retire, and the rising elderly population.

Hard to reach groups, vulnerable residents and more importantly the people/organisations that support them

the public in general, however more attention should be paid to the vulnerable groups and those demographics who are more susceptible to fires

FRS’ work in schools and in the community is invaluable in educating people to be safer, but guess the usual young, old, disabled, and those who dabble in anti social behaviour are at risk groups

I believe the review should be conducted on a risk basis, including taking account of the changes to come over the next several years not just decade. To focus on one particular group within the community for other reasons would not be advantageous in this instance

All groups should be considered. We provide a service for everyone in North Yorkshire

All

No

You should consider all sections of the community equally

Other blue light services. FRSs we share borders with. District/Borough councils (including City of York) - Sharing and devolving of responsibilities in more cost effective ways

Parish/Town councils, owners of high risk premises (care homes, hospitals etc), police and ambulance service
I think we should be trying to share our facilities with other emergency services. This would demonstrate to the public that we are a united service embracing efficiency. We would also improve inter agency interoperability.

The number of dwellings that are planned annually by each Council under the current Government Policies which in turn will increase the population, traffic on the roads, amenities and risk.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 1</strong> The approach to the review is logical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good management requires matching resources to demand. This approach does that. Well done!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The fire service should not be run</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everything needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 2</strong> Whilst the process of the review is complex, the approach we are taking to the review is clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seems a lot of different things are being taken into account, but do they all hold relevance to the fire brigade and what it does. Plus the more systems used to look at it, the it is clear that the process is data led which is a strength resources should be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 3</strong> We should take account of different levels of risk and numbers of incidents in the provision of fire cover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification to a fire death can not be that historically no fires occurred in your area so we won’t warrant you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just because the number of incidents is falling, it doesn’t mean serious incidents don’t occur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 4</strong> We should be looking at using a range of vehicles not just traditional fire engines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No because then it will take longer for a fire engine to arrive on the scene.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numerous new combi vehicles have been trialled to be scrapped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is a ‘traditional’ engine anyway? You admit to not moving with the times??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolutely makes sense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 5</strong> We should be looking to secure additional capacity to deal with major events such as flooding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thought North Yorkshire already had that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>this would help keep normal business resources at a sensible level whilst providing additional capacity when</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 6</strong> There are anomalies in the cost of current provision compared to the number of incidents in different areas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 7** Historically, low incident numbers has meant that we provide fewer fire engines or that they have longer turnout times (e.g. Thirsk has 1 fire engine with a 5 minute turnout time compared to Scarborough which has two fire engines each with a 1 minute turnout time). If the number of incidents significantly reduces in an area we should consider changing the fire cover there (please choose one option). To do otherwise is not a sensible or cost effective use of resources.

**Question 8** Are there any particular groups or sections of the community we should consider in the review?
- Everyone may need your services, they should expect and receive a service if ever.
- Everyone one in North Yorkshire, public and businesses Can't do this unless it shows all incidents and not average. What about when engines go to different areas in the county.
- Consider the whole community and the impact these cuts will have on NYFRS being able to keep people safe.....
- I expect that all sections will be considered.
- No - All equal.
- Everyone in North Yorkshire.
- Nope.
- Yes, those living/working in rural areas who should get at least the same provision as town/city dwellers, however it takes a whole lot longer to mobilise to rural incidents vis a vis urban incidents.
- Increases in ageing population and the provision of new build specialist accommodation.
- The elderly.
- Elderly without internet access.
- Vulnerable elderly people living alone.
- the most vulnerable need to be identified and ways of working should be developed to do.
- Isolated groups such as forming communities. Concentration of the disabled.
- Student population and aged persons. HIMOs and student house density. High rise buildings.
- The community team who provides talks are invaluable to society as they prevent so many fires.

**Question 9** Have you any other suggestions that we should consider in the review?
- Stats mean nothing when your own house is on fire or car in a crash. Just because it is a "one in ten year incident" doesn't mean that provision can be less than useful.
- what the end goal is? Emergencies are rarely planned, therefore cutting services.
- Ensure the Government ministers know that you cannot keep trimming the fire service, senior officers have to stand up for their fire service and say enough is enough.
carry out the review to cut costs, we are all more clued up now, we do not need

| Start again?? | None |