

Operational Efficiency Options – summary of each option

Hull	
1.	Remove the second engine from East Hull
2.	Crew the second engine at East Hull with on call firefighters instead of full time firefighters
3.	Crew all engines in Hull with four firefighters and also crew a Small Fires Unit (SFU)
4.	Crew all engines in Hull with four firefighters, but don't crew a SFU.
5.	Remove second engine from East Hull, crew with four and crew a SFU.
6.	Remove second engine from East Hull, crew with four, but don't crew a SFU.
7.	Convert second engine at East Hull to on call, crew with four and crew a SFU.
8.	Convert second engine at East Hull to on call, crew with four, don't crew a SFU.
Immingham	
9.	Remove second engine from Immingham West.
10.	Merge the Immingham Stations at Immingham East and remove one engine.
Grimsby	
11.	Remove one engine from Cromwell Road.
12.	Merge Peaks Lane and Cromwell Road and remove one engine overall.
13.	Remove one engine from Cromwell Road, not crew the Cleethorpes and Waltham engines and relocate full time engines from Grimsby into those areas during an evening.
14.	Remove one engine from Cromwell Road, replace the engines at Cleethorpes and Waltham with SFUs and use them for small fires in the Grimsby, Cleethorpes and Waltham areas.
15.	Merge Peaks Lane and Cromwell Road and remove one engine, not crew Cleethorpes and Waltham engines and relocate full time engines from Grimsby into those areas during an evening.
16.	Merge Peaks Lane and Cromwell Road and remove one engine, replace the engines at Cleethorpes and Waltham with SFUs and use them for small fires in the Grimsby, Cleethorpes and Waltham areas.

Option 1: Remove the second fire engine from East Hull Fire Station

This option would reduce the number of fire engines at East Hull from two to one. That would mean that the overall number of fire engines in Hull would be reduced from seven to six. The predetermined attendances to incidents would remain the same (for example two fire engines would still be sent to dwelling fires).

Pros

- The predicted increase in risk is the same as it would be if the engine was replaced by an on-call engine, whilst the savings would be greater.
- During consultation options including removing an engine from East Hull were more favoured than options to change the engine to on-call, however, in general options involving removing the engine in combination with crewing engines in Hull with four firefighters which were favoured over implementing it as a stand-alone change.

Cons

- The savings are below average in comparison to the other options in Hull.
- The overall number of firefighting vehicles in Hull would be reduced in comparison to options which include crewing a Small Fires Unit where the overall number would remain the same, or options to crew the engine with on call firefighters where the number of firefighting vehicles would stay the same or increase.

Option 2: Crew the second fire engine at East Hull Fire Station with on-call firefighters instead of full-time firefighters

This option would mean that some full-time firefighters at East Hull would be replaced by on-call firefighters in the same way as was approved for Goole in 2008. The on-call firefighters would live or work within five minutes of the station and respond to the station when needed.

Pros

- This option has the smallest predicted impact on response standards; in fact there is a marginal improvement in first engine response due to the fact that for some incidents the on-call engine will still be available for simultaneous incidents as two other full-time engines will have attended the incident due to their quicker response.
- The overall numbers of firefighters would not be reduced by as many as removing the engine and it would provide some local employment.
- The number of firefighting vehicles in Hull would remain the same

Cons

- The savings are relatively low compared to other Hull options.
- The predicted effect on risk is the same as it would be if the engine was removed, whilst the savings would be less.
- It was the least favoured option by staff during consultation.
- There would be significant training costs required for the new on-call firefighters.
- Due to the fact that there are options to remove the engine completely, and we know that more savings will be needed beyond this programme, it may be that the Authority still reviews the need for the engine at all at a later date, in the same way as has been done in Goole.

Option 3: Crew all fire engines in Hull with four firefighters and also crew a Small Fires Unit (SFU)

This option would mean that instead of two fire engines in Hull being crewed with four firefighters and five being crewed with five firefighters, they would all be crewed with four firefighters. Some of the firefighters made available by that change would be used to permanently crew a Small Fires Unit which would be used predominantly to deal with small fires, such as rubbish fires, which would keep the remaining engines available for life critical incidents. In order to better provide for firefighter numbers at an incident the predetermined attendances would be changed so that instead of two firefighting vehicles being sent to a dwelling fire, in Hull three would be sent (two fire engines and the small fires unit or three fire engines). That would increase the number of firefighters sent to an incident in Hull from 8 or 9 to 10 or 12. The SFU response time would not be counted in terms of performance against the Response Standards and therefore the engines would still need to get to incidents as quick as they do now. If the SFU attended first that would simply be beneficial to the public at the incident, rather than helping the Service's performance.

Pros

- The number of firefighting vehicles in Hull would be increased.
- The Small Fires Unit would mean that the normal fire engines would be less likely to be tied up at small fires and therefore more available for life critical incidents.
- The number of firefighters attending dwelling fires in Hull would be increased.
- The crew of the SFU would provide a level of resilience for the other engines and could be used to cover unexpected short term staff shortages.

Cons

- This is the smallest saving of all of the options in Hull.
- Even though there would be more firefighting vehicles in Hull the response standards would still be negatively impacted as more vehicles would be sent to dwelling fires.
- This is not an option that was strongly favoured during consultation.
- There may be a moral pressure on the crew of the Small Fires Unit if they arrive first at a dwelling fire as they would not be able to enter to search and rescue in breathing apparatus. However there are many other useful tasks which could be undertaken such

as medical care to anyone who has self-rescued, intelligence gathering relating to the location of the fire or the casualties and the securing of water supplies. It should be borne in mind that as the SFU would only be mobilised in addition to engines, not instead of one, if they did arrive first that would be a quicker attendance than normal and therefore would be an improved service to the public. The moral pressure would be the same as is currently experienced by officers who arrive at an incident before an engine does, although on those occasions their attendance is still preferable to the public having to wait for the fire engine with no other attendance.

Option 4: Crew all fire engines in Hull with four firefighters, but don't crew a Small Fires Unit (SFU)

This option would be similar to Option 3 in that all of the fire engines in Hull would be crewed with four firefighters, however, the SFU would not be crewed, other than if there were enough available staff. In this case three fire engines would be mobilised to a dwelling fire instead of two so the number of firefighters at the incident would be increased from 8 or 9 to 12.

Pros

- The savings are higher than if an SFU was crewed.
- The number of firefighters at an incident would be increased.
- The potential situation of moral pressure on the SFU crew would be avoided.

Cons

- The savings are below average compared to the other options in Hull.
- This option is the one least favoured in Hull overall and is less favoured by staff than crewing with four and crewing an SFU.
- The predicted effect on response standards is higher than if the SFU is crewed.
- The opportunity to get the SFU to an incident quicker would be removed.
- The SFU would not be available to provide crewing resilience for unexpected staff shortages.

Option 5: (Combination of 1 & 3) Remove the second fire engine from East Hull Fire Station, crew all fire engines in Hull with four firefighters and crew an SFU
--

This option is a combination of Options 1 and 3 above and so would involve removing an engine from East Hull, crewing all fire engines in Hull with four firefighters and crewing an SFU. All the other arrangements described in 1 and 3 would apply. If implemented then the SFU would be located at East Hull station as that is the area that it is used more often when it can be crewed at present.

Pros

- Above average savings compared to the other options in Hull.
- It was the option most favoured by staff, and the second most favoured overall, during consultation.
- The overall number of firefighting vehicles in Hull would remain the same.
- The overall number of firefighting vehicles at East Hull station would remain the same.
- The SFU crew would provide a level of staffing resilience for unexpected staff shortages.

Cons

- The effect on second engine response is relatively high, although not as high as if the SFU is not crewed.
- There may be moral pressure on the crew of the SFU as described in option 3, although it should be borne in mind that the public would, in that case, have received a quicker response than if the SFU had not been crewed.

Option 6: (Combination of 1 & 4) Remove the second fire engine from East Hull Fire Station, crew all fire engines in Hull with four firefighters, but don't crew an SFU

This option is a combination of Options 1 and 4 above and so would involve removing an engine from East Hull, crewing all fire engines in Hull with four firefighters, but not crewing an SFU. All the other arrangements described in 1 and 4 above would apply.

Pros

- This option gives the largest possible savings in Hull.
- It was the most favoured option in Hull overall during consultation.
- It was the option which was most favoured by residents during consultation.
- The number of firefighters at a dwelling fire would be increased.
- The potential situation of moral pressure on the SFU crew would be avoided.

Cons

- The predicted effect on response standards is higher than if the SFU was crewed.
- The opportunity to get the SFU to an incident quicker would be removed.
- The overall number of firefighting vehicles in Hull would be reduced
- The SFU crew would not be available to provide staffing resilience for unexpected staff shortages.

Option 7: (Combination of Options 2 & 3) Crew the second fire engine at East Hull Fire Station with on-call firefighters instead of full-time firefighters, crew all fire engines in Hull with four firefighters and crew an SFU

This option is a combination of Options 2 and 3 above. It would mean that a full time engine at East Hull would be replaced by an on-call engine; all engines in Hull would be crewed with four firefighters and the SFU would be crewed. All other arrangements described in 2 and 3 above would apply.

Pros

- Above average savings compared to the other Hull options.
- Below average effect on the first engine response standard.
- The overall number of firefighters would not be reduced by as many as removing the engine and it would provide some local employment.
- The number of firefighting vehicles in Hull would be increased.
- The SFU would mean that the engines would be less likely to be tied up at a small fire and therefore more available for life critical incidents.
- The number of firefighters attending dwelling fires in Hull would be increased.
- The SFU crew would provide a level of staffing resilience for unexpected short-term staff shortages.

Cons

- It is not an option which was favoured during consultation and was the second least favoured by staff
- The predicted effect on risk is the same as it would be if the engine was removed.
- There would be significant training costs required for the new on-call firefighters.
- Due to the fact that there are options to remove the engine completely, and we know further savings will be needed beyond this programme, it may be that the Fire Authority will review the need for the engine at all at a later date, in the same way as has been done in Goole.

Option 8: (Combination of Options 2 & 4) Crew the second fire engine at East Hull Fire Station with on-call firefighters, crew all fire engines in Hull with four firefighters and don't crew a SFU

This option is a combination of options 2 and 4 above. It would mean that a full time engine at East Hull would be replaced by an on-call engine; that all engines in Hull would be crewed by four firefighters, but the SFU would not be crewed. All other arrangements described in Option 2 and 4 above would apply.

Pros

- The second highest possible savings in Hull.
- The overall number of firefighters would not be reduced by as many as removing the engine and it would provide some local employment.
- The overall number of firefighting vehicles in Hull would remain the same.
- The number of firefighters at a dwelling fire in Hull would be increased.
- The potential for moral pressure on the SFU crew would be removed.

Cons

- The predicted effect on risk is the same as if the engine was removed.
- There would be significant training costs for the new on-call firefighters
- The predicted effect on first engine response is greater than if the SFU was crewed.
- The opportunity to get the SFU to an incident quicker would be removed.
- The SFU would not be able to provide crewing resilience for unexpected, short term, staff shortages.
- Due to the fact that there are options to remove the engine completely, and we know that further savings will be needed beyond this programme, it may be that the Authority will review the need for the engine at all at a later date, in the same way as has been done for Goole.

Option 9: Remove the second fire engine from Immingham West Fire Station
--

This option would involve removing one of the two engines at Immingham West. That would leave one full-time engine at Immingham West and one full-time engine at Immingham East.

Pros

- No predicted effect on risk.
- No predicted effect on first engine response.
- Implementation would mean that some firefighters who have been posted from Hull to stations on the South Bank may be able to be returned and therefore incur less cost to travel to work.

Cons

- The savings are lower than the other Immingham option.
- There was a strong view expressed during consultation that this option was not the one favoured in Immingham.

Option 10: Merge the Immingham stations at Immingham East Station and remove one fire engine
--

This option was one which was suggested by staff during the engagement phase. The two stations at Immingham would be merged at Immingham East Station and one engine would be removed as part of that process. This would increase the number of engines based at Immingham East from one to two, and would mean that there would be no engine permanently based at Immingham West. However, the intention would be to still retain Immingham West as an operational fire station and split the Immingham engines between the two stations as required. So, for example, it could be that during the night time hours the two engines would be split – one at Immingham East and one at Immingham West. The station would also continue to be used as a training venue which means that on many occasions there would be operational engines at Immingham West in any case undertaking training; these would still be available to be used at a large incident if required.

Pros

- The larger of the possible savings in Immingham due to reduced managerial costs as well as the savings from removing the engine.
- Very strong support for this option during consultation with it being the most favoured option for Immingham by a considerable margin.
- Implementation would mean that some firefighters who have been posted from Hull to stations on the South Bank may be able to be returned and therefore incur less cost to travel to work.

Cons

- The predicted effects on risk and response are greater than for those for Option 9. However, the intention to split the engines between Immingham West and Immingham East, at some times of the day, would mean those effects would in real terms be smaller than the prediction.

Option 11: Remove one fire engine from Cromwell Road Fire Station

This option would involve removing an engine from Cromwell Road so it had one engine based at that station.

Pros

- The predicted effects on risk and response are the lowest of the Grimsby options.
- Implementation would mean that some firefighters who have been posted from Hull to stations on the South Bank may be able to be returned and therefore incur less cost to travel to work.
- It was the Grimsby option second most favoured overall during consultation

Cons

- The savings are the lowest of the Grimsby options.
- It was the Grimsby option least favoured by staff during the consultation.

Option 12: Merge Peaks Lane and Cromwell Road Stations and remove one fire engine

This option would involve Peaks Lane Station, which currently has two full time engines and Cromwell Road Station which also currently has two full time engines, merging and an engine removed overall so there would be one station in Grimsby with three engines. The merger could be done by selling off both sites and building a new station or alternatively the three engines could be based at Peaks Lane, the existing station, without compromising response standards. If the option was implemented in that way then the intention would be that the station at Cromwell Road would retain an engine which could be crewed if needed for large incidents on a recall to duty basis. Cromwell Road would also be used for other activities, such as youth work. Arrangements to split the engines between Peaks Lane and Cromwell Road at certain times, dependent on risk, could be implemented, for example, during the night time one fire engine could be located at Cromwell Road and two at Peaks Lane.

Pros

- The savings are larger than Option 11 due to the additional savings in managerial costs.
- The option would allow consideration to be given to the ideal location for a station in Grimsby.
- If the stations at Cromwell Road and Peaks Lane were both maintained then the engines could be split between the two as required. For example, during the night.
- This was the Grimsby option most favoured overall during consultation
- Implementation would mean that some firefighters who have been posted from Hull to stations on the South Bank may be able to be returned and therefore incur less cost to travel to work.

Cons

- The effect on response standards is larger than just removing the engine from Cromwell Road, although that risk would be minimised if the engines were split between the two stations at certain times of the day.
- There wasn't strong support for this option from staff during consultation, it was the second least favoured

Option 13: Remove one fire engine from Cromwell Road Fire Station, don't crew the Cleethorpes and Waltham fire engines and relocate full-time engines from Grimsby into those areas during an evening

This option would involve removing an engine from Cromwell Road station so there would be three full-time engines in Grimsby. During the evenings those engines would be split between the Grimsby, Cleethorpes and Waltham areas. The station at Cleethorpes and Waltham would not normally be crewed, but could be stood up for large incidents on a recall to duty basis. It is the intention that in the medium term the crewing at Cleethorpes and Waltham would be gradually reduced by not replacing personnel who leave.

Pros

- Relatively large savings.
- The predicted effect on risk and first engine response are relatively low.
- Implementation would mean that some firefighters who have been posted from Hull to stations on the South Bank may be able to be returned and therefore incur less cost to travel to work.

Cons

- Splitting the three engines on an evening may limit the scope for some other risk reduction activities.
- In the long term there may be a need to consider redundancies at Cleethorpes and Waltham depending upon staff retention rates.
- The option was the least favoured in Grimsby, Cleethorpes and Waltham overall and by residents.

Option 14: Remove one fire engine from Cromwell Road Fire Station, replace the fire engines at Cleethorpes and Waltham with SFUs and use them for small fires in Grimsby, Cleethorpes and Waltham areas

This option would involve removing an engine from Cromwell Road, so it had one full-time engine, and replacing the on-call engines at Cleethorpes and Waltham with SFUs which would be mobilised to most small fires in the Grimsby, Cleethorpes and Waltham areas. The SFUs would be crewed by on-call firefighters and the intention would be that the crewing at those stations would be gradually reduced to the level required to crew the SFUs as personnel leave the Service naturally. It would be the intention to explore whether the SFUs could be also used to support the Ambulance Service response to medical emergencies in that area.

Pros

- Permanent crews would be maintained at Cleethorpes and Waltham and therefore the potential for future redundancies would be reduced.
- The SFUs would mean that the full-time engines in Grimsby would be less likely to be tied up at a small fire and therefore more available for life critical incidents.
- The effect on response standards is less than Option 13 due to the SFU availability.
- As well as considering support to the Ambulance Service the SFU could be used to attend other incidents, such as Road Traffic Collisions
- Implementation would mean that some firefighters who have been posted from Hull to stations on the South Bank may be able to be returned and therefore incur less cost to travel to work.

Cons

- The savings are the second lowest of the Grimsby, Cleethorpes and Waltham options.
- There wasn't strong support for the option during consultation.

Option 15: Merge Peaks Lane and Cromwell Road Stations and remove one fire engine, don't crew Cleethorpes and Waltham fire engines and relocate full-time engines from Grimsby into those areas during an evening

This option is similar to Option 13 with the only difference being that Peaks Lane and Cromwell Road would be merged, rather than just one engine being removed from Cromwell Road. All other arrangements described in Option 13 above would apply.

Pros

- This is the option with the highest savings in Grimsby, Cleethorpes and Waltham.
- This was the Grimsby, Cleethorpes and Waltham option most favoured by staff during consultation.
- The effect on risk is the same as the option to merge the stations without the changes at Cleethorpes and Waltham.
- The option would allow consideration to be given to the ideal location for a station in Grimsby.
- If the stations at Cromwell Road and Peaks Lane were both maintained then the engines could be split between the two as required. For example, during the night.
- Implementation would mean that some firefighters who have been posted from Hull to stations on the South Bank may be able to be returned and therefore incur less cost to travel to work.

Cons

- The effect on response standards is larger than just removing the engine from Cromwell Road, although that risk could be minimised if the engines were split between the two stations at certain times of the day.
- Relatively large predicted effect on first engine response.

Option 16: Merge Peaks Lane and Cromwell Road Stations and replace the fire engines at Cleethorpes and Waltham with SFUs and use them for small fires in the Grimsby, Cleethorpes and Waltham areas.

The option is similar to Option 14 with the only difference being that Peaks Lane and Cromwell Road would be merged, rather than just one engine being removed from Cromwell Road. All other arrangements described in Option 14 above would apply.

Pros

- Relatively large savings.
- The predicted effect on risk is the same as the options to merge the stations without the changes at Grimsby and Cleethorpes.
- As well as considering support to the Ambulance Service the SFU could be used to attend other incidents, such as Road Traffic Collisions
- The Grimsby, Cleethorpes and Waltham option second most favoured by staff
- The option would allow consideration to be given to the ideal location for a station in Grimsby.
- The SFUs would mean that the full-time engines in Grimsby would be less likely to be tied up at a small fire and therefore more available for life critical incidents.
- If the stations at Cromwell Road and Peaks Lane were both maintained then the engines could be split between the two as required. For example, during the night.
- Implementation would mean that some firefighters who have been posted from Hull to stations on the South Bank may be able to be returned and therefore incur less cost to travel to work.

Cons

- The effect on response standards is larger than just removing the engine from Cromwell Road, although that risk could be minimised if the engines were split between the two stations at certain times of the day.
- Relatively large predicted effect on first engine response standards.