

**THE HIGHLAND AND ISLANDS FIRE BOARD
IRMP WORKING GROUP**

IRMP RISK REVIEW

Agenda Item	
Report No	

Summary

The purpose of this report is to present recommendations appertaining to the second phase of the Risk Review proposal agreed by the Board on the 23rd January 2009, notably to 'Review stations which present serious Sustainability issues'.

1. OVERVIEW

- 1.1 HIFRS currently has 95 Retained stations providing emergency response to operational incidents across the Service area, supported by 14 Community Response Units. Whilst the Service and individual units have made good progress in supporting and improving performance, a small number of stations still give the Service cause for concern in terms of their effectiveness, availability and safety. Each brings into question their current and future sustainability.
- 1.2 The performance of stations has been reviewed as part of the Fire Board's Risk Review Framework, with the Service's CRM department undertaking a Service-wide Sustainability Review extending over a 36 month period from 1st April 2006 to 31st March 2009.
- 1.3 In addition to the data captured and analysed as part of the Sustainability Review, information relating to operational activity for the period 1st April 2004 to 31st March 2009 for stations with a full intervention role, and 1st June 2005 to 31st March 2009 for stations assuming Community Response Unit (CRU) status providing a combination of CFS, Wildfire and RTC roles have also been reviewed.
- 1.4 Whilst the intervention inter relationship between all stations cannot be considered until the later stages of the IRMP Risk Review, the stations for which recommendations have been made appear to have serious sustainability issues.
- 1.5 The following recommendations are made to address serious concerns and bring about long term improvements where possible. Recommendations are based on the Combined Sustainability and other supporting information as appropriate.

Recommendation

Members of the IRMP Working consider and agree to recommend to the full Board each of the detailed recommendations contained within the IRMP Risk Review Phase II Sustainability Report appertaining to the 15 named stations.

BRIAN A MURRAY
CHIEF FIRE OFFICER
Date: 11th August 2009

Highland and Islands Fire Board



IRMP Risk Review

Phase II Sustainability Report

Appendices	3
1.0 Purpose of the Report	4
2.0 Introduction	4
3.0 Drivers for the Review	5
3.1 Background Information	5
3.2 The Legal Obligation for Fire Fighter Safety	5
4.0 Application of the Methodology to Stations / Units Presenting Serious Sustainability Issues.	7
5.0 Recommendations.....	8
5.1 Flotta	8
5.2 Foula	9
5.3 Torridon	9
5.4 Ardgour	10
5.5 Glenborrodale	10
5.6 Glenuig.....	11
5.7 Minginish.....	11
5.8 Eriskay.....	12
5.9 Glendale.....	12
5.10 Hamnavoe.....	13
5.11 Strathconon	13
5.12 Struan	14
5.13 Eigg	14
5.14 Muck	15
5.15 Papa Stour	15
6.0 IRMP Risk Review - Phase III	16

Appendices

Appendix A	Capital Build Programme Methodology
Appendix B	Overall Combined Sustainability Scoring
Appendix C	Station Specific Reports for Stations Presenting Serious Sustainability Issues
C1	Flotta
C2	Foula
C3	Torridon
C4	Ardgour
C5	Glenborrodale
C6	Glenuig
C7	Minginish
C8	Eriskay
C9	Glendale
C10	Hamnavoe
C11	Strathconnon
C12	Struan
C13	Eigg
C14	Muck
C15	Papa Stour

Review of Stations Which Present Serious Sustainability Issues

1.0 Purpose of the Report

The aim of Integrated Risk Management Planning (IRMP) is to deliver a risk appropriate service, provide appropriate levels of safety for firefighters and reduce community risk. IRMP seeks to ensure that we have staff, who are properly equipped and trained, to deal with emergencies as and when they occur

The purpose of this report is to present recommendations appertaining to the second phase of the Risk Review proposal agreed by the Board on the 23rd January 2009, notably to 'Review stations which present serious Sustainability issues'.

The accepted outcomes from this report will be carried forward into the agreed third phase of the Board's Risk Review, being 'The assessment of the contribution each station (appliance) makes to life safety'. At this stage the most appropriate provision of intervention resources for the entire service area will be considered.

2.0 Introduction

HIFRS currently has 95 retained stations providing emergency response to operational incidents across the Service area, supported by 14 community response units (CRU). While the service and individual units have made good progress in supporting and improving performance, a small number of stations still give cause for service concern in terms of effectiveness, availability and safety. Each brings into question their current and future sustainability.

The performance of stations has been reviewed as part of the Fire Board's Risk Review Framework, with the service's CRM department undertaking a service-wide Sustainability Review extending over a 36 month period from 1st April 2006 to 31st March 2009.

In addition to the data captured and analysed as part of the Sustainability Review, information relating to operational activity for the period 1st April 2004 to 31st March 2009 for stations with a full intervention role, and 1st June 2005 to 31st March 2009 for stations assuming CRU status providing a combination of community fire safety (CFS), wildfire and road traffic collision (RTC) roles have also been reviewed.

The large amount of data captured as part of the Risk Review has been analysed and brought together using a comprehensive and validated Methodology approved by the Board, to form a table of all stations (including second appliances) presented in order of Combined Sustainability Score.

3.0 Drivers for the Review

3.1 Background Information

In recent years the Fire Board has made considerable progress in enhancing the quality of service provided for communities throughout the Highlands and Islands. This improvement in service, which has resulted in enhanced levels of safety, has been achieved by developing the capability to provide an appropriate intervention response and proactively progressing a wide spectrum of prevention initiatives.

While in recent years the Board has made significant progress in enhancing training, equipment and facilities throughout the service area there still remain significant challenges before the full aspirations of the Board can be realised. In analysing risk to achieve the appropriate allocation of resources and mapping the path to deliver this provision the Board has had to consider:

- That the location and current provision of intervention resources is based on the outdated standards of fire cover, now replaced by the risk based approach of Integrated Risk Management Planning (IRMP)
- The Fire Service Emergency Cover (FSEC) risk modelling software initially considered intervention response based upon predetermined values of performance, which have now been amended to reflect actual performance
- The service whilst managing intervention response in the past did not have the technology, information or capacity to consider the sustainability of stations

Utilising the full potential of the FSEC risk modelling software and now employing the sustainability methodology adopted for the Capital Build Programme Priority, the Board is now able to address each of the items highlighted above and consider those stations which present serious sustainability issues.

3.2 The Legal Obligation for Fire Fighter Safety

Fundamental to ensuring an effective and appropriate response to operational incidents is the number of personnel available to provide a prompt response no matter the time of the call. The number of crew available is not only relevant to achieve a successful outcome for the emergency incident but is also crucial to ensure safe systems of work can be employed by the responding firefighters. To achieve the required safe system of work the minimum number of personnel required by HIFRS to form a safe crew is four.

To ensure that stations are able to respond to all incidents 24hrs/day 7days/week and to allow firefighters to maintain the appropriate work/life balance the Service maintains an average station establishment of ten to twelve personnel to crew one appliance, which generally allows a minimum of four and a maximum of six people to crew the appliance. To ensure sufficient crew are available to provide an emergency response at all times the

minimum number of declared hours of individual availability for a one appliance Retained duty station must exceed 672 hours in total. Assuming that staff are able to provide the full 120hrs of cover required per week then the minimum number of personnel required to provide continuous cover would be six people.

With regard to intervention response the need to ensure a safe system of work is implemented each and every time an appliance responds to an emergency call is a clearly defined legal obligation placed on the Board and Fire and Rescue Service.

The legal obligations are contained in the following legislation/regulations:

- The Health and Safety at Work Act 1974 – defines the legal liability of individual board and Service members for health and safety failures
- The Management of Health and Safety at Work Regulations 1999 - Section 5 Health and Safety arrangements further enhances the above act ensuring that under Section 5 - every employer shall make and give effect to such arrangements as are appropriate, having regard to the nature of his activities and the size of his undertaking, for the effective planning, organisation, control, monitoring and review of the preventive and protective measures
- Corporate Manslaughter and Corporate Homicide Act 2007 - this Act includes an offence for convicting an organisation where a gross failure in the way activities were managed or organised results in a person's death

As general guidance:

If a health and safety offence is committed with the consent or connivance of, or is attributable to any neglect on the part of, any director, manager, secretary or other similar officer of the organisation, then that person (as well as the organisation) can be prosecuted under section 37 of the Health and Safety at Work etc Act 1974

Recent case law has confirmed that directors cannot avoid a charge of neglect under section 37 by arranging their organisation's business so as to leave them ignorant of circumstances which would trigger their obligation to address health and safety breaches

Those found guilty are liable for fines and, in some cases, imprisonment

(Leading Health and Safety at Work Leadership Actions for Directors and Board Members)

4.0 Application of the Methodology to Stations / Units Presenting Serious Sustainability Issues

For this stage of the Risk Review of the Service being undertaken by the Board the Sustainability information and methodology used during the “Capital Build Programme Priority” has been utilised. This methodology is detailed in Appendix A.

Applying the Methodology to the captured data and presenting it in the Combined Sustainability Score format (Appendix B) provides a robust and measured reflection of how Stations and Units perform.

Whilst the Combined Sustainability Score will ultimately be used to consider the contribution each station (appliance) makes to life safety and hence will influence the most appropriate provision of resources for the Service area, at this stage of the Risk Review the following are being considered:

- Those retained duty stations which have establishments falling below the minimum requirement of six personnel which as such present serious Sustainability issues
- Those CRUs which have a CFS/wildfire only role which have establishments falling below the minimum requirement of six personnel which as such present serious Sustainability issues
- Those CRUs previously allocated a CFS only role which have less than two members

As such, stations and units identified in the following table are those which cause serious concern relating to current sustainability data

Station	Current role
Flotta	Retained
Foula	Retained
Torrison	Retained
Ardgour	CRU – wildfire/CFS role only
Glenborrodale	CRU – wildfire/CFS role only
Glenug	CRU – wildfire/CFS role only
Minginish	CRU – wildfire/CFS role only
Eriskay	CRU – CFS role only
Glendale	CRU – CFS role only
Hamnavoe	CRU – CFS role only
Strathconon	CRU – CFS role only
Struan	CRU – CFS role only
Eigg	CRU – First Aid Firefighting/CFS role only
Muck	CRU – First Aid Firefighting/CFS role only
Papa Stour	CRU – First Aid Firefighting/CFS role only

For these station/units a detailed analysis of information available has been completed and recommendations for each individual station/unit have been identified. These recommendations are contained within Appendix C.

5.0 Recommendations

Whilst the intervention inter relationship between all stations cannot be considered until the later stages of the IRMP Risk Review, these stations appear to have serious sustainability issues.

The following recommendations are made to address serious concerns and bring about long term improvements where possible. Recommendations are based on the Combined Sustainability and other supporting information as appropriate.

For each of the stations a detailed report containing information, conclusions and recommendations is contained within the station / unit specific section of Appendix C

A précis of Recommendations are as follows;

5.1 Flotta

Current role - Retained Duty Station

Recommendation

- **The Flotta unit should be allocated a twelve month period in which to recruit sufficient members and demonstrate that they can provide a safe and effective intervention response**
- **It is hoped, that with the commitment of the existing personnel and the support of the community and service, the sustainability issues can be resolved within the twelve months**
- **If this does not prove possible and the unit and local community are not able to demonstrate an appropriate level of performance, the Board should consider changing the role to that of a CRU delivering CFS information and education only**
- **The CRM department will continue to review the risk associated with Flotta as part of the ongoing Risk Review process**

Recommendations cont.

5.2 Foula

Current role - Retained Duty Station

Recommendation

- **The Board accept that the local community is unable to support a safe and effective intervention response. Therefore the board should no longer support the provision of an intervention role on Foula**
- **All households on Foula will be offered follow-up HFSC**
- **The status of the Foula unit be changed to that of a CRU, having the role to undertake CFS information and education only**
- **The CRM department will continue to review the risk associated with Foula as part of the ongoing Risk Review process**

5.3 Torridon

Current role - Retained Duty Station

Recommendation

- **The Torridon unit should be allocated a twelve month period in which to recruit sufficient members and demonstrate that they can provide a safe and effective intervention response**
- **It is hoped, that with the commitment of the existing personnel and support from the community and the service, the sustainability issues can be resolved within twelve months**
- **If this does not prove possible and the station and local community are not able to demonstrate an appropriate level of performance, then the Board should consider changing the Torridon role to that of a CRU delivering CFS information and education only**
- **The CRM department will continue to review the risk associated with Torridon as part of the ongoing Risk Review process**

Recommendations cont.

5.4 Ardgour

Current role – CRU, wildfire/CFS role only

Recommendation

- **The Ardgour unit currently has no members and it has not proven possible for the local community to support the unit at Ardgour. As such the Board accept that the local community is unable to support a safe and effective intervention response. Therefore the board should no longer support the provision of a unit at Ardgour.**
- **A wildfire response to the area will be provided utilising the wider resources of the service**
- **All current and future requests for home fire safety checks and CFS activities to be performed by personnel from adjacent stations and the dedicated Lochaber based Community Safety Advocate (CSA)**
- **The CRM department will continue to review the wildfire risk associated with the service area as part of the ongoing Risk Review process**

5.5 Glenborrodale

Current role - CRU, wildfire/CFS role only

Recommendation

- **The Glenborrodale unit currently has no members and it has not proven possible for the local community to support the unit at Glenborrodale. As such the Board accept that the local community is unable to support a safe and effective intervention response. Therefore the board should no longer support the provision of a unit at Glenborrodale.**
- **A wildfire response to the area will be provided utilising the wider resources of the service**
- **All current and future requests for HFSC and CFS activities to be performed by personnel from adjacent stations and the dedicated Lochaber based CSA**
- **The CRM department will continue to review the wildfire risk associated with the service area as part of the ongoing Risk Review process**

Recommendations cont.

5.6 Glenuig

Current role - CRU, wildfire/CFS role only

Recommendation

- **The Glenuig unit should be allocated a twelve month period in which to recruit sufficient members and demonstrate that they can provide a safe and effective intervention response**
- **It is hoped, that with the commitment of the existing personnel and the support of the community and the service, the sustainability issues can be resolved within the twelve months**
- **If this does not prove possible and the unit are not able to demonstrate an appropriate level of performance then the Board should consider changing the role to that of a CRU delivering CFS information and education only**
- **The CRM department will continue to review the wildfire risk associated with the service area as part of the ongoing Risk Review process**

5.7 Minginish

Current role - CRU, wildfire/CFS role only

Recommendation

- **The Minginish unit should be allocated a twelve month period in which to recruit sufficient members and to demonstrate that they can provide a safe and effective intervention response**
- **It is hoped, that with the commitment of the existing personnel and the support of the community and the service, the sustainability issues can be resolved within the twelve months**
- **If this does not prove possible and the unit are not able to demonstrate an appropriate level of performance then the Board should consider changing Minginish's role to that of a CRU delivering CFS information and education only**
- **The CRM department will continue to review the wildfire risk associated with the service area as part of the ongoing Risk Review process**

Recommendations cont.

5.8 Eriskay

Current role - CRU, CFS role only

Recommendation

- **With the Board supporting a full intervention resource at Lochboisdale and the construction of the causeway it is recommended that the requirement for a CRU with a CFS role on Eriskay is no longer required**
- **All current requests and future requirement for HFSC and CFS activities will be performed by personnel from Lochboisdale station supported by the dedicated Western Isles based CSA**
- **The CRM department will continue to review the risk associated with Eriskay as part of the ongoing Risk Review process**

5.9 Glendale

Current role - CRU, CFS role only

Recommendation

- **The Glendale unit currently has no members and the local community is unable to support the unit at Glendale. As such the Board accept the position and provide the appropriate level of CFS support utilising the wider resources of the service**
- **All current requests and future requirement for HFSC and CFS activities will be performed by personnel from Broadford station supported by the dedicated Skye and Lochalsh based CSA**
- **The CRM department will continue to review the risk associated with Glendale as part of the ongoing Risk Review process**

Recommendations cont.

5.10 Hamnavoe

Current role - CRU, CFS role only

Recommendation

- **The Hamnavoe unit should be allocated a twelve month period in which to recruit at least one other unit member and demonstrate that they can effectively deliver CFS information and education**
- **It is hoped, that with the commitment of the existing person and the support of the community and the service, the sustainability issues can be resolved within the twelve months**
- **Following this period should the unit not be able to demonstrate an appropriate level of performance then the Board accept the position and provide the appropriate level of CFS support utilising the wider resources of the service. Therefore the board should no longer support the provision of a CFS CRU unit at Hamnavoe**
- **The CRM department will continue to review the risk associated with Hamnavoe as part of the ongoing Risk Review process**

5.11 Strathconon

Current role - CRU, CFS role only

Recommendation

- **The Strathconon unit should be allocated a twelve month period in which to recruit one other unit member and demonstrate that they can effectively deliver CFS information and education**
- **It is hoped, that with the commitment of the existing person and the support of the community and the service, the sustainability issues can be resolved within the twelve months**
- **Following this period should the unit not be able to demonstrate an appropriate level of performance then the Board accept the position and provide the appropriate level of CFS support utilising the wider resources of the service. Therefore the board should no longer support the provision of a CFS CRU unit at Strathconon**
- **The CRM department will continue to review the risk associated with Strathconon as part of the ongoing Risk Review process**

Recommendations cont.

5.12 Struan

Current role – CRU, CFS role only

Recommendations

- **The Struan unit should be allocated a twelve month period in which to recruit at least one other unit member and demonstrate that they can effectively deliver CFS information and education**
- **It is hoped, that with the commitment of the existing person and the support of the community and the service, the sustainability issues can be resolved within the twelve months**
- **Following this period should the unit not be able to demonstrate an appropriate level of performance then the Board accept the position and provide the appropriate level of CFS support utilising the wider resources of the service. Therefore the board should no longer support the provision of a CFS CRU unit at Struan**
- **The CRM department will continue to review risk associated with Struan as part of the ongoing Risk Review process**

5.13 Eigg

Current role - CRU, First Aid Firefighting/CFS role only

Recommendation

- **The Eigg unit should be allocated a twelve month period in which to recruit sufficient members and to demonstrate that they can provide a safe and effective intervention response**
- **It is hoped, that with the commitment of the existing personnel and the support of the community and the service, the sustainability issues can be resolved within the twelve months**
- **If this does not prove possible and the unit are not able to demonstrate an appropriate level of performance then the Board should consider changing the Eigg unit role to that of a CRU delivering CFS information and education only**
- **The CRM department will continue to review risk associated with Eigg as part of the ongoing Risk Review process**

Recommendations cont.

5.14 Muck

Current role - CRU, First Aid Firefighting/CFS role only

Recommendation

- **The Muck unit should be allocated a twelve month period in which to recruit sufficient members and demonstrate that they can provide a safe and effective intervention response**
- **It is hoped, that with the commitment of the existing personnel and the support of the community and the service, the sustainability issues can be resolved within the twelve months**
- **If this does not prove possible and the unit are not able to demonstrate an appropriate level of performance then the Board should consider changing the role of Muck to that of a CRU delivering CFS information and education only**
- **The CRM department will continue to review risk associated with Muck as part of the ongoing Risk Review process**

5.15 Papa Stour

Current role - CRU, First Aid Firefighting/CFS role only

Recommendation

- **The Papa Stour unit currently has one member and it has not proven possible for the local community to further support the unit. The Board accept that it has not proven possible to support a safe and effective intervention response and therefore the role of the unit be changed to that of a CRU with the role of delivering CFS information and education only**
- **In this new role the Papa Stour unit should be allocated a twelve month period in which to recruit at least one other unit member and demonstrate that they can effectively deliver CFS information and education**
- **It is hoped, that with the commitment of the existing personnel and the support of the community and the service, the sustainability issues can be resolved within the twelve months**

- **Following this period should the unit not be able to demonstrate an appropriate level of performance then the Board accept the position and provide the appropriate level of CFS support utilising the wider resources of the service. Therefore the board should no longer support the provision of a CFS CRU unit on Papa Stour.**
- **The CRM department will continue to review risk associated with Papa Stour as part of the ongoing Risk Review process**

6.0 IRMP Risk Review - Phase III

In the formulation of the methodology which has allowed the evidence to support the 'Capital Build Programme Priority' to be gathered and subsequent production of this Phase II report, the Service has made significant progress in moving forward the Risk Review of the Service area project.

The accepted outcomes from this report will be carried forward into the agreed third phase of the Risk Review proposal, being 'The assessment of the contribution each station (appliance) makes to life safety'. At this stage the most appropriate provision of intervention resources for the Service area will be considered.

During this stage the aspiration of the Board to provide the best possible levels of safety for the communities of the Highlands and Islands will be fully explored. At the meeting of the full Board on the 24th November 2005 the members agreed the general parameters for the Risk Review.

Extract from Minutes:

"In discussion they (members present) indicated their unwillingness to see sustainable stations closed on the basis of FSEC data but, without prejudice, accepted that consideration could be given to:

- a) changing the role of stations where these were unsustainable (e.g. where not enough recruits could be found or appropriate cover could not be provided)*
- b) changing the role of stations on the basis of identified risk*
- c) relocation of resources from multi-pump stations*
- d) the creation of new retained stations and*
- e) increasing revenue expenditure above current levels*

Any changes, however, would require to be assessed on individual merit, with the information available being thoroughly scrutinised."

To allow the true value of stations to be assessed, performance information will continue to be gathered as part of the Sustainability Review.

Applying the principle of IRMP during the next stage of the review the inter relationship between stations/areas of risk will be considered and mapped against performance and Service resilience to ensure the best possible solution to response provision is developed in line with the Boards aspirations.

At this stage of the review the outcomes from Phase III cannot be pre-empted but through Sustainability performance information, being widely circulated to stations highlighting specific areas of performance the opportunity is presented to each station / appliance to consider how enhanced performance may, if possible, be achieved.