



Insight | Change | Management



East SDA Technical Review Day

Report

3 September 2024

Contents

1	INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1	Introduction	1
1.1.1	Indicative Scoring	1
2	SUMMARY OF OUTCOMES	2
2.1	Summary of Proceedings	2
2.2	Options to Proceed (retained).....	4
2.3	Deferred Options	4
2.4	Rejected Options	6
	APPENDIX ONE: CONSIDERATION CRITERIA	7
	APPENDIX TWO: OPTION REVIEW NOTES	9

Document	SFRS East SDA Technical Review Day		
Version	V2	Date	3 September 2024
Status	Final		

1 INTRODUCTION

Background and Context

1.1 Introduction

The document summarises the proceedings of the Senior Leaders Workshop for the Strategic Service Reform Programme (SSRP) held on August 15, 2024, at the National Headquarters of the Scottish Fire and Rescue Service in Cambuslang.

The potential scenarios for change under consideration in this workshop were all related to the East Service Delivery Area (SDA).

All decision makers and subject matter experts invited to take part in this initial appraisal were provided with a detailed briefing pack circulated in advance of the workshop which contained:

- A background to the way the options for East SDA have been developed.
- A section which provides a description of:
 - i. How at the beginning of any options development and appraisal (ODA) process, hurdle criteria (also known as 'essential' or 'gateway' criteria) are used to filter a long list of change proposals. A proposal must meet these criteria to be considered further. Hurdle criteria work as a simple Yes/No filter.
 - ii. The two criteria chosen for this initial technical exercise (Financial Viability and Modernization) are used to shorten the very long list to a manageable size for a full hurdle criteria appraisal.
- An explanation of the role of decision makers and that of the subject matter experts who were present to support the process.
- An explanation of the change options provided in the very-long list under consideration in the workshop.

This was supported by four appendices:

1. Appendix A: Hurdle Criteria – Financial Sustainability and Modernisation
2. Appendix B: Station Information and Options Framework
3. Appendix C: Mapping Key
4. Appendix D: Timeline Roadmap

1.1.1 Indicative Scoring

Each option was given a provisional score on the following basis:

	Criterion is considered to be met based on the evidence and balance of strengths and weaknesses.
	Criterion is NOT considered to be met based on the evidence and balance of strengths and weaknesses.
	Criterion is undecided and requires further investigation, application of a strategic principal or strategic prioritisation.

2 SUMMARY OF OUTCOMES

The key results from the East SDA technical review workshop

2.1 Summary of Proceedings

The workshop's primary objective was the (internal to SFRS) application of two of the agreed hurdle criteria to a very long list of service delivery proposals to reduce them to a manageable level for hurdle appraisal before evaluation (balanced room) appraisal.

The meeting was attended by senior leaders and decision-makers across various departments. These included the Deputy Chief Officer, directors of finance, operations, training, prevention, and strategic planning, among others.

The decision makers were supported by subject matter experts across different domains, from the team responsible for developing the technical proposals; finance; HR; legal; equality, diversity, and inclusion (EDI); and facilities/assets management.

The primary objective of the workshop was to review the East Service Delivery Area (SDA) and apply higher level hurdle criteria to narrow down a large number of options to a manageable list for hurdle appraisal proper.

The process was guided by an independent facilitator from ASV with significant experience in consultation. A structured approach was adopted where each option was given time for discussion and consensus reached among the decision makers. Those consensus decisions focused on elimination, retention, or deferral of the options.

Decision makers present agreed that any potential solutions that were deferred might come back into play if the retained options were insufficient on their own in forming 'configurations.' If they do not come back into play by the time SFRS goes to consultation they should be regarded as excluded.

Decision makers also agreed that excluded options were omitted from consideration on the understanding that they might be revisited should circumstances change and/or new evidence come to light that warrants a change of status.

The options were reviewed against the following two criterion¹:

- **FINANCIAL SUSTAINABILITY:** Does the option contribute to long-term financial sustainability in terms of capital and/or resource budget costs?
- **MODERNISATION:** (i) Does the option contribute to the modernisation of the Service as outlined in the Programme vision? (ii) Does it achieve at least one of the following?
 - Contributes to increasing organisational capacity and/or better use of our resources and facilities.

¹ Details of the two hurdle criterion selectively applied in this exercise to reduce the scenarios to a viable long list are included at appendix One of this report.

- Address issues regarding the attraction and retention of staff.
- Enhance community safety including through prevention and preparedness.

Consideration was also given to equalities impact implications of the proposals, notably if there were any associated concerns or high-level adverse impacts for communities and protected characteristic groups.

The discussions in the workshop provided consideration of the extent to which there were so called 'super criteria' which led to agreement of the service's immediate priorities. These super criteria applied to options which required immediate action such as stations:

- That have RAAC panels.
- Were affected by the temporary pump withdrawal in 2023.
- Which have not been able to mobilise a crew for several years (dormant stations).

Therefore, if an option contained a solution to one of those issues it was agreed that it should be prioritised for the next stage. In this context, these can therefore be considered as 'super options.'

Conversations drew out the level of interdependency between many of the options which led to agreement that for technical consideration of the North and West options future presentation would focus on a cluster approach.

It was also recognised that the projected savings were likely to materialise at a lower than forecast level due to unanticipated factors, which could include, for instance, increased labour and material costs in construction projects.

The key decisions from the review of East SDA proposals saw that out of 31 options presented for consideration against the two key criterion:

- Eight (8) were retained.
- Twelve (12) were deferred.
- Eleven (11) were discarded.

These are presented in summary in the next sections and in detail in Appendix Two of this report, which also highlights the interdependencies between each of the options.

2.2 Options to Proceed (retained)

The eight options selected to proceed following deliberation to achieve consensus are shown in the table below.

Option Number	Description	Decision
104	- Close Marionville Station. - Relocate 1 WT pump to Newcraighall Station.	Proceed
110	- Rebuild Tranent Station (RAAC) on a new near-optimal site as a 2 Pump WT+OC Station. - Close Musselburgh Station and relocate 1 WT Pump to Tranent Station. Dependent on Option 104 (Proceed) above.	Proceed
028	Reduce Bo'ness 1st Pump crewing from 5WDS to DSDS+OC. Consider with Option 068 <i>Falkirk</i> (Deferred)	Proceed
146	- Close Linlithgow 1 Pump OC station. - Relocate Linlithgow OC crew to Bo'ness. Consider with Option 028 <i>Falkirk</i> (proceed) above	Proceed
072	- Reduce Hawick 1st WT Pump crewing to DSDS/OC. - Introduce a Nucleus Crew Hub at Galashiels. Consider with Option 118 <i>Peebles</i> (Deferred).	Proceed
061	Replace the Dunfermline 3rd WT Combined Aerial Rescue Pump (CARP) with a dedicated High Reach Appliance (HRA).	Proceed
046	Close the Long-Term Dormant 1 Pump OC station at Crianlarich. Consider with Option 140 <i>Tyndrum</i> (Deferred)	Proceed
145	- Permanently remove the 2nd WT Pump from two of the following three stations: ○ Glenrothes, Lochgelly, Methil	Proceed (amended)

2.3 Deferred Options

The twelve options deferred from current consideration based on a requirement for further information were as follows.

Option Number	Description	Decision
082	- Supported by acceptance of option 110 (Tranent) above: - Withdraw Haddington 2nd OC pump. - Reconfigure and refurbish Haddington as a 1 Pump On-Call station and Nucleus Crew Hub for the East Lothian area.	Defer
113	- Supported by acceptance of option 082 (Haddington) above: - Withdraw North Berwick 2nd OC pump.	Defer

Option Number	Description	Decision
	- Reconfigure and refurbish as a 1 Pump On-Call station. - Provide additional On-Call Support as per Option 082 above.	
068	Increase the Falkirk 2nd Pump duty system from OC to DSDS/OC. Consider with Option 028 Bo'ness.	Defer
129	Merge Anstruther and St. Monan's stations and crews into a new 1 Pump OC station at near-optimal site to the south of Anstruther.	Defer (129b)
118	- Withdraw Peebles 2nd OC Pump. - Support on-call availability from local Nucleus Crew Hub. Consider with Option 072 Galashiels & Hawick.	Defer
105	- Close Marionville Station. - Permanently withdraw 1 WT pump.	Defer
144	Change St. Andrew's 1st Pump duty system from OC to DSDS/OC	Defer
018	Increase Bathgate 2nd Pump duty system from OC to DSDS. Consider with Option 143 Whitburn (below.)	Defer
143	Introduce a Nucleus Crew Hub at Whitburn to support local OC availability. Consider with Option 018 Bathgate and Option 049 Shotts (WSDA).	Defer
032	Introduce a Nucleus Crew Hub at Broxburn 1 Pump OC station to support local OC availability.	Defer
032 (035)	Introduce a Nucleus Crew Hub at Callander 1 Pump OC station to support local OC availability.	Defer
140	Introduce a Nucleus Crew Hub at Tyndrum 1 Pump OC station to support local OC availability. Consider with Option 46 Crianlarich.	Defer

2.4 Rejected Options

Those options (eleven) where deliberations reached the consensus view that they should not be considered and further were as shown below.

Option Number	Description	Decision
BAU (pp.20)	- Maintain current pump configuration at <i>North Berwick</i>. - Extend, reconfigure, and refurbish as a 2 Pump On-Call station.	Discard
BAU (pp.20)	- Based on acceptance of option 110 (Tranent) above: - Maintain current pump configuration at <i>Haddington</i>. - Extend, reconfigure, and refurbish as a 2 Pump On-Call station	Discard
076	Reduce the duty system of the <i>Glenrothes</i> 2nd Pump from WT 5WDS to DSDS/OC.	Discard
102	Reduce the duty system of the <i>Lochgelly</i> 2nd Pump from WT 5WDS to DSDS/OC or OC.	Discard
106	Reduce the duty system of the <i>Methil</i> 2nd Pump from WT 5WDS to DSDS/OC or OC.	Discard
031	- Close either <i>Bridge of Allan Station</i> or <i>Doune Station</i>. - Relocate OC crew to <i>Dunblane</i>.	Discard
BAU (pp24)	Replace the <i>Dunfermline</i> 3rd WT Pump (CARP) with 3rd Pump and dual crewed HRA.	Discard
BAU (pp10)	- Rebuild Marionville Station on current site. - Maintain 1 WT pump at Marionville Station.	Discard
BAU (pp13)	Rebuild Tranent Station (RAAC) on a new near-optimal site as a 1 Pump OC Station.	Discard
BAU (pp13)	Extend, reconfigure, and refurbish Musselburgh Station on current site as a 1 Pump WT Station.	Discard
052	- Withdraw the 2nd OC pump from Denny. - Reconfigure and refurbish as a 1 Pump On-Call station. Consider with Option 068 Falkirk and Options 049 Cumbernauld, West SDA.	Discard

APPENDIX ONE: CONSIDERATION CRITERIA

Hurdle Criteria – Financial Sustainability and Modernisation

Criteria Description	Example Considerations
1. Does the option contribute to long-term financial sustainability in terms of capital and/or resource budget costs?	• Based on financial modelling of employee-based resource costs. • Expert knowledge of Property Function. • Impact on posts. • Reduction of pumps or stations. • Station upgrades which reduce running and maintenance costs.
2. Does the option contribute to the modernisation of the Service as outlined in the Programme vision? Does it achieve at least one of the following?	• Releases Wholetime (WT) station posts from an over-resourced location (relative to national measures of risk and demand) enabling resource and capacity increases at an under-resourced location, or to a relevant supporting function i.e. Prevention, Protection or Preparedness (PP&P), Training, On-Call Support. • Combines two 1-pump wholetime stations into a 2-pump WT station enabling more flexible and efficient working practices. • Merges one or more stations into a lesser number of station locations.
Address issues regarding the attraction and retention of staff.	• Supports retention and diversity of roles within WT staff. • Results in an on-call station upgrade where the current property “condition” and/or “suitability” is considered inadequate. • Provides additional on-call support posts enabling additional interventions which improve attraction and retention for an on-call station. • Provides an on-call station relocation/merger which combines existing crews and/or expands the available population pool for recruitment. • Provides an opportunity to introduce an alternative duty system which may be attractive to a more diverse group of existing or potential employees
Enhance community safety including through prevention and preparedness.	• Provides additional prevention work within communities. • Enables the transfer of WT station-based employees to dedicated PPP roles. • Provides additional on-call support posts enabling additional PPP activity.
Enhance firefighter safety.	• Creates capacity for training. • Addresses decontamination limitations via a station new-build, reconfiguration, and/or refurbishment.

Criteria Description	Example Considerations
	- Provides additional WT employee capacity to engage in gathering and maintenance of operational intelligence. - More station-based WT employees. - Dedicated WT posts. - Provides additional on-call support posts enabling additional: - Gathering and maintenance of operational intelligence. - Preparedness audit and improvement tasks.
Support of partnership working.	- Results in a property refurbishment or reconfiguration which supports a partner organisation. - Results in a co-location with a partner organisation. - Provides additional WT employee capacity to engage in partnership working. - More station-based WT employees. - Dedicated WT posts. - Provides additional on-call support posts enabling additional partnership working.

APPENDIX TWO: OPTION REVIEW NOTES

Scribes record of deliberation to reach consensus on each option.

Strategic Service Review Programme

Session:	Technical Considerations Exercise
Date:	15 th August 2024
Venue:	SFRS HQ, Cambuslang
Scribe Names:	Paul McGovern and Alicia Mulvey

Option:	104. Close Marionville Station. Relocate 1 Wholetime Pump to Newcraighall Station.			SDA: East
104	Initial Status		Proceed to full hurdle criteria appraisal	☒
	Financial Sustainability?	Modernisation?	Discard from further consideration	☐
		5	Further information required to make a decision	☐
	Equalities cleared? (Y/N)			
Option:	105. Close Marionville Station. Permanently withdraw 1 WT Pump.			
105	Initial Status		Proceed to full hurdle criteria appraisal	☐
	Financial Sustainability?	Modernisation?	Discard from further consideration	☐
		1	Further information required to make a decision	☐
	Defer			☒
	Equalities cleared? (Y/N)			

Option:	BAU. Rebuild Marionville Station on current site.		
BAU	Maintain 1 WT pump at Marionville Station.		
	Initial Status		Proceed to full hurdle criteria appraisal
	Financial Sustainability?	Modernisation?	☐
			☒
		2	Further information required to make a decision
			Equalities cleared? (Y/N)
Consensus Discussions (record key points only)			
We want to keep the pump. Removing pump would leave Edinburgh even shorter than it is now. Relocate it and do something better with it. Further dependencies for Marionville noted may have a domino effect on other stations like Newcraighall and Tranent. Marionville station has a RAAC roof. The availability of a site at Tranent was explored. There is no site locked in at Tranent however there is an option to acquire a site. The building work cannot be completed while operating from the site. Option 105 would mean eliminating the pump. If the budget was cut 105 would allow for cost savings to be made. 104 should remain an option as it makes sense in terms of finance, helps with response times. Does the option closing Marionville increase community safety? Would the residents of Marionville consider closing the station an increase in community safety? Are attraction / retention and community safety really green? Comments captured that they should perhaps be grey. BAU not financially viable. No sites available. This means status quo – refurb as is continue spending capital on these stations.			
Further information required for decision (record all)			
Cluster the interdependent options into 1 configuration for next workshop. Need to explore overall impact further at impact analysis stage and in relation to feasibility criteria. Need to define what's feasible in the next 5 years for the next stage.			

Option: 110	110. Rebuild Tranent Station (RAAC) on a new near-optimal site as a 2 Pump WT+OC Station. Close Musselburgh Station and relocate 1 WT Pump to Tranent Station . <i>Dependent on Option 104 above.</i>			SDA: East	
	Initial Status		Proceed to full hurdle criteria appraisal	☒	
	Financial Sustainability?	Modernisation?	Discard from further consideration	☐	
		4 to a 5	Further information required to make a decision	☐	
			Equalities cleared? (Y/N)		
Option: BAU	BAU. Rebuild Tranent Station (RAAC) on a new near-optimal site as a 1 Pump OC Station.				
	Initial Status		Proceed to full hurdle criteria appraisal	☐	
	Financial Sustainability?	Modernisation?	Discard from further consideration	☒	
		1	Further information required to make a decision	☐	
			Equalities cleared? (Y/N)		
Option: BAU	BAU. Extend, reconfigure, and refurbish Musselburgh Station on current site as a 1 Pump WT Station.				
	Initial Status		Proceed to full hurdle criteria appraisal	☒	
	Financial Sustainability?	Modernisation?	Discard from further consideration	☐	

			Further information required to make a decision	☐
			Equalities cleared? (Y/N)	
Consensus Discussions (record key points only)				
110 – increase from a green 4 to a green 5. This is in also because it is RAAC so is therefore a Super criterion (double tick).				
Further information required for decision (record all)				
110 needs to stay in but whether that is long term is unknown. Dependent on availability of sites. Need to keep in until have full financial picture.				
Tranent site is too small so need to buy land regardless. Property confirmed 6 potential sites have been identified already. Confirmed it will cost more to build new site than what we get for capital receipt. Is there any distance whereby a 'move' needs to be consulted on? There is no set distance that ND is aware of. If going to make the change need to assess, does it have a negative impact. Building a new station could have a negative impact on some communities. The North Berwick option is still there independent of Haddington.				

Option:	082. Supported by acceptance of option 110 (Tranent) above:		SDA:
082	Withdraw Haddington 2 nd OC pump. Reconfigure and refurbish Haddington as a 1 Pump On-Call station and Nucleus Crew Hub for the East Lothian area.		East
Initial Status		Proceed to full hurdle criteria appraisal	☐
Financial Sustainability?	Modernisation?	Discard from further consideration	☐
		Further information required to make a decision	☐
		Defer	☒
Equalities cleared? (Y/N)			

Option: BAU	BAU. Based on acceptance of option 110 (Tranent) above: Maintain current pump configuration at Haddington . Extend, reconfigure, and refurbish as a 2 Pump On-Call station			SDA: East	
		Initial Status	Proceed to full hurdle criteria appraisal		
	Financial Sustainability?	Modernisation?	Discard from further consideration		
			Further information required to make a decision		
		Equalities cleared? (Y/N)			
Option: 113	113. Supported by acceptance of option 082 (Haddington) above: Withdraw North Berwick 2 nd OC pump. Reconfigure and refurbish as a 1 Pump On-Call station. Provide additional On-Call Support as per Option 082 above.				SDA: East
		Initial Status	Proceed to full hurdle criteria appraisal		
	Financial Sustainability?	Modernisation?	Discard from further consideration		
			Further information required to make a decision		
			Defer		
		Equalities cleared? (Y/N)			
Option: BAU	BAU. Maintain current pump configuration at North Berwick . Extend, reconfigure, and refurbish as a 2 Pump On-Call station.				SDA: East

	Initial Status		Proceed to full hurdle criteria appraisal
	Financial Sustainability?	Modernisation?	
			☒
		2	Further information required to make a decision ☐
Equalities cleared? (Y/N)			
Consensus Discussions (record key points only)			
082 - Doesn't need to go forward at this time? Are we setting a long-term strategy at this point? Suggestion is that 82 and 113 could be deferred even though score strongly. Where do we break the chain in the ripple effect? Logical break at Tranent. New model in East of Edinburgh. Remove a 2nd appliance at an OC might be a something we don't need to do at this point. On call is a delicate ecosystem and will influence behaviour elsewhere. If we have sustainable inexpensive asset, is it best decision making to discount that? But mitigated to a degree through nucleus crew addition. We can have core principle but flexible to local areas. But need to capture sufficiently. BAU - Why would we consult on BAU? Does it have potential to be part of a configuration to cover the area? What value does it have? It links in to 082 – if that isn't approved then maintaining the status quo. Agreed to take it out for the time being. If need to revisit it, then do so. If only 2 modernisation greens, then need to review 61 as already in place in a temp basis. Majority of BAU are red, anything that is BAU is unlikely to have a green across the modernisation RAGs. BAU is flip side of 113 – if reject 113 we are choosing BAU. Some low scoring ones are trigger ones for others. If option fails, then BAU is the fallback.			
Further information required for decision (record all)			
113 - OC availability of the second pump? When it is the right time to look at this? Do we need to keep this to avoid pre-determination. This option could be independent of other options. Not dependent on what happens at Haddington. Based on op risk and demand. It is a standalone option. Can't agree it to go forward so defer for further consideration. Ripple effect – need to consider as part of wider config – is it pivotal on Tranent? If leaving 82 in with nucleus hub, goes together with this. If there is a financial dimension and if it allows us to reduce costs, then leaving it in makes sense. There is argument that it might fit into configurations and relationships and relationship with 82. Could be excluded at hurdle criteria stage. Still has potential to change decisions.			

We need to consider if we have a sustainable asset is it best use of decision making to discount it? This will have an impact on individuals, what mitigations could be taken. Operationally, is that the direction we would want to go in?

Challenges with multiple communities and multiple stakeholders. The needs of the different SDA areas vary. Localism exists. The CRIM has been completed, what is the community risk, what is the demand needs? Looking at the modelling needs to be the starting point.

Option: 061	061. Replace the <i>Dunfermline</i> 3 rd WT Combined Aerial Rescue Pump (CARP) with a dedicated High Reach Appliance (HRA).		SDA: East	
	Initial Status		Proceed to full hurdle criteria appraisal	
	Financial Sustainability?	Modernisation?	Discard from further consideration	
			Further information required to make a decision	
Equalities cleared? (Y/N)				
Option: BAU	BAU. Replace the <i>Dunfermline</i> 3 rd WT Pump (CARP) with 3 rd Pump and dual crewed HRA.		SDA: East	
	Initial Status		Proceed to full hurdle criteria appraisal	
	Financial Sustainability?	Modernisation?	Discard from further consideration	
			Further information required to make a decision	
Equalities cleared? (Y/N)				
Consensus Discussions (record key points only)				
061: All agreed only in place on temp basis and this needs to stay in.				
BAU: It is all red so why keep it?				

Understand the motivation to put the pumps back in on an alternative duty system. The communities are dispersed. The second pump is going to take time to disperse. Concern about the public perception of community safety in the area by reintroducing the pump. Option to stick with the pump removal but switch stations or go for a longer-term system changing the duty system and introducing on call. The modelling previously informed it was a positive decision to remove the pump. It has been proven operations can be effective removing the pump. If an alternative duty system was implemented it would take time, this would maintain status quo for now, would that suggest it still has to stay as there is a viability. There will be intense opposition in the area following previous withdrawals. Day crewing systems time implications need to be understood further. A short-term option may need to be considered. The viability of the options come on a timeline. The combination of options adds up financially.	Further information required for decision (record all) Have to understand local perception and previous withdrawals as well as operational need. Need evaluation to confirm that removing pumps was the right thing to do. Option to look at overall resilience in due course e.g. on call. Identify timeline in options and risks (e.g. land availability).
--	---

Option:	076. Reduce the duty system of the <i>Glenrothes</i> 2nd Pump from WT 5WDS to DSDS/OC.			SDA: East
076	Initial Status		Proceed to full hurdle criteria appraisal	☐
	Financial Sustainability?	Modernisation?	Discard from further consideration	☒
			Further information required to make a decision	☐
			Equalities cleared? (Y/N)	
Option:	102. Reduce the duty system of the <i>Lochgelly</i> 2nd Pump from WT 5WDS to DSDS/OC or OC.			SDA: East
102	Initial Status		Proceed to full hurdle criteria appraisal	☐

	Financial Sustainability?	Modernisation?	Discard from further consideration	☒
			Further information required to make a decision	☐
	Equalities cleared? (Y/N)			
Option: 106	106. Reduce the duty system of the <i>Methil</i> 2nd Pump from WT 5WDS to DSDS/OC or OC.			
	Initial Status		Proceed to full hurdle criteria appraisal	☐
	Financial Sustainability?	Modernisation?	Discard from further consideration	☒
			Further information required to make a decision	☐
	Equalities cleared? (Y/N)			
Option: 145	145. Permanently remove the 2 nd WT Pump from two of the following three stations: <i>Glenrothes, Lochgelly, Methil</i> .			
	Initial Status		Proceed to full hurdle criteria appraisal (amended)	☒
	Financial Sustainability?	Modernisation?	Discard from further consideration	☐
			Further information required to make a decision	☐
	Equalities cleared? (Y/N)			
Consensus Discussions (record key points only)				
076 - Consider with 102, 145 and 106. Would make up part of a configuration. Discussion on whether this should be deferred as can't reach consensus. Can't afford to bring more people in so alternative duty systems are appropriate. Why would we bring people back in if				

there was an over provision in Fife. No specialisms are considered yet. Risk of not getting land here? Is it really viable? Why not just keep Anstruther rather than close both and build new? Question on how viable is it to buy new land in Anstruther. Lochgelly has a specialist resource. Are we agreed to take this option out? The analysis is done from the base model, not temp withdrawals. There is the potential to merge these options into a single option– 106, 104, 76. Gives a better service and it is cheaper. DSDS is much cheaper than a 5WDS. We have temporarily removed the appliances but permanently removed the people. Final discussion on removal of this option because no option to bring people back in.	
Further information required for decision (record all)	
145: All agreed to remove Glenrothes from this.	

Option: 129 / 129b	129. Merge <i>Anstruther</i> and <i>St. Monan's</i> stations and crews into a new 1 Pump OC station at near-optimal site to the south of Anstruther.	Proceed to full hurdle criteria appraisal		SDA: East
	Initial Status			☐
	Financial Sustainability?	Modernisation?	Discard from further consideration	☐
			Further information required to make a decision	☐
			Defer (as 129b)	☒
Consensus Discussions (record key points only)				
Could be grouped across the area. Similar to Crianlarich - been off the run for a while. St Monans not crewed for a number of years. If introducing a new crewing, then needs Equality impact assessment – could change things. Need for consistency as this is the same scenario as Bridge of Allan. Here there is a virtual station. Will see this replicated in the North. Model has been determined by the staff.				
Equalities cleared? (Y/N)				

Option:	144. Change St. Andrew's 1 st Pump duty system from OC to DSDS/OC.			SDA: East
144	Initial Status		Proceed to full hurdle criteria appraisal	☐
	Financial Sustainability?	Modernisation?	Discard from further consideration	☐
			Further information required to make a decision	☐
			Defer	☒
Equalities cleared? (Y/N)				
Consensus Discussions (record key points only)				
Weak on finances but strong on modernisation. Would be packaged up with other Fife options – this is an additional enhancement. So, take this out of this particular discussion. Argument that this should be located elsewhere in Fife. It is a mitigation which could be included as part of consultation.				

Agreed that 129 as it stands is out but a new129b should be considered as a deferred option. Still need to change the wording though to include new optimal site close to Anstruther. The current wording implies you must move it rather than it being optimal. The viability in terms of assets and costs of moving the station needs to be considered.

Optimal locations may not make a different to the operational response time. Financial sustainability for the merger of a new station is green however with the purchase of the new land it is not necessarily green.

Further information required for decision (record all)

Need to investigate a 129b. Could just move into Anstruther? Consider wording of option to say we could just use one current site. Don't imply we HAVE to move it. Change option to a full stop after 1 pump OC station. Costs don't include land purchase. More financially viable to reconfigure existing station. Make it a merged option.

Will we consult on North Fife as a package or individual stations – this is all part of the package. Are we consulting on a regional model or individual elements? This isn't a change to our service that we need to consult on. For this project it doesn't need to be considered. Can we do this for all Financial viability=grey. Agree to defer 144, 018, 143, 032, 035 and 140, develop options and then see how they fit. These will only feature in hurdle criteria event only if deem them to be included in a configuration scenario. These are only possible if they can be afforded.
Further information required for decision (record all)

Option: 052 052. Withdraw the 2nd OC pump from Denny. Reconfigure and refurbish as a 1 Pump On-Call station. Consider with Option 068 Falkirk below and Options 049 Cumbernauld, West SDA.	SDA: East																
<table border="1"> <tr> <td colspan="2">Initial Status</td> <td>Proceed to full hurdle criteria appraisal</td> <td>☐</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Financial Sustainability?</td> <td>Modernisation?</td> <td>Discard from further consideration</td> <td>☒</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>3 reds out of 5</td> <td>Further information required to make a decision</td> <td>☐</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="4">Equalities cleared? (Y/N)</td> </tr> </table>	Initial Status		Proceed to full hurdle criteria appraisal	☐	Financial Sustainability?	Modernisation?	Discard from further consideration	☒		3 reds out of 5	Further information required to make a decision	☐	Equalities cleared? (Y/N)				
Initial Status		Proceed to full hurdle criteria appraisal	☐														
Financial Sustainability?	Modernisation?	Discard from further consideration	☒														
	3 reds out of 5	Further information required to make a decision	☐														
Equalities cleared? (Y/N)																	
Consensus Discussions (record key points only)																	
Do we want to reconfigure as one or a two-pump station. Neither likely to happen any time soon. Two-part question – can still ask the question about removing the second pump. Is this pump needed?																	

£23,000 resource saving but longer-term capital savings. Part of a bigger package in Falkirk area. Is like BofA or Crianlarich? Not massive savings. Focus on more important priorities. How would you go about delivering the change to relocate colleagues. This could lead to a redundancy case. The second on call pump is sustainable. Consideration of the Denny option needs to factor in the resilience. There is a risk that the amount of activity been carried out by each fire fighter at the station would mean although they are not being made redundant, they are in effect being made redundant by not having enough workload.
Further information required for decision (record all)
Could bundle these to the side and revert to OCSCG / bring back later.

Session:	Technical Considerations Exercise
Date:	15 th August 2024
Venue:	SFRS HQ, Cambuslang
Scribe Names:	Heather Sleight, Donna Mayberry, and Ramona Coxall

Option:	068. Increase the Falkirk 2nd Pump duty system from OC to DSDS/OC. Consider with Option 028 Bo'ness below.		SDA: East
068	Initial Status		Proceed to full hurdle criteria appraisal ☐
	Financial Sustainability?	Modernisation?	Discard from further consideration ☐
			Further information required to make a decision ☐
			Defer ☒

	Equalities cleared? (Y/N)
Consensus Discussions (record key points only)	
This is an enhancement. Doesn't meet the super criteria.	
Enhancements should stay in a specific category as these are good things to do. Put these in to present something that will be positive.	
Falkirk one is a mitigation if we do something at Bo'ness and Linlithgow.	
Capital may be involved with the refurbishment of the building. Falkirk ties in with Bathgate. Option for a day crew at Bathgate. We do not need Bathgate and Falkirk as additional resilience. Demand may increase if there are changes around Linlithgow and Bo'ness.	
Agreed to defer.	
Further information required for decision (record all)	
Need to consider alongside Bathgate, don't need both? Is resourcing just short or demonstrably short?	

Option: 028	028. Reduce Bo'ness 1 st Pump crewing from 5WDS to DSDS+OC. Consider with Option 068 Falkirk above.		SDA: East
	Initial Status		Proceed to full hurdle criteria appraisal ☒
	Financial Sustainability?	Modernisation?	Discard from further consideration ☐
			Further information required to make a decision ☐
			Equalities cleared? (Y/N)
Option: 146	146. Close Linlithgow 1 Pump OC station. Relocate Linlithgow OC crew to Bo'ness . Consider with Option 028 Falkirk above.		SDA: East

Initial Status		Proceed to full hurdle criteria appraisal	
Financial Sustainability?	Modernisation?		
	3		☐ Discard from further consideration ☐ Further information required to make a decision
Equalities cleared? (Y/N)			☐
Consensus Discussions (record key points only)			
028 - Interdependency with Linlithgow. Links to 068 so they need to sit together as part of configuration thinking. It makes 068 affordable. They way it is written – need to keep Linlithgow open. Non-compliant buildings. What is our risk appetite? Falkirk has an under provision. The configuration should move resource to where there is a need. Every time we keep an appliance and building – means additional cost. This is a financial enabler. Crew would be relocated but not appliance. Combined on call. 5WDS watch would be redeployed. Is it actually green? 146 - It has two reds so should we not put this forward. Document says that option to release money by moving Boness to DSDS was dependent on keeping Linlithgow open. But doesn't make sense to retain both stations. The way it is written doesn't present as financially viable. Closing Linlithgow isn't reliant on Boness. Question if reliant on Falkirk. Do we need the reliance. Decouple this option from the others. Happy for it to carry forward because it is being decoupled. The combination of the configuration of stations is a financial enabler. MORDD process hasn't been considered to this point. Bo'ness is the enabler for West Lothian so need to keep something in. As will be no additional funding to enable changes in West Lothian. Need to keep Bo'ness in. Links to Linlithgow or it doesn't. Or accept there are no changes without any new money. Keep them in buckets so that can have attractive options or not as required. If keep it in – will it cause a problem? And how will it be presented at consultation? It is a different option for consultation. Doesn't feel it presents as financially viable, moving Bo'ness to DSDS would save £ but is dependent on keeping Linlithgow open. Strength in taking things forward as neat package of options. This was cited as an example of the need for a single SFRS. Agreed to keep it in after discussion. Requires an enhancement of on call staff so has to be done in conjunction with closure of Linlithgow Additional savings of training etc not incorporated.			

DSDS in Falkirk do we really need it? De couple it and don't say there is a dependency. 028 to remain in for next round to see outcome of Falkirk area changes.	
Further information required for decision (record all)	
Reword option to say 'change' not reduce. Review all options for more neutral terms. Have to be able to sell other benefits. Incorporate additional savings of training etc. Work up configurations that do and don't include it. Work up a few options for each area. Need to change the description and maybe financial RAG is more of a grey.	

Option:	018. Increase Bathgate 2nd Pump duty system from OC to DSDS. Consider with Option 143 Whitburn below.	SDA: East								
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <th style="width: 25%; padding: 5px;">Initial Status</th> <th style="width: 75%; padding: 5px;">Proceed to full hurdle criteria appraisal</th> </tr> <tr> <td style="width: 25%; text-align: center; padding: 5px;">Financial Sustainability?</td> <td style="width: 75%; text-align: center; padding: 5px;">Discard from further consideration</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="width: 25%; text-align: center; padding: 5px;"></td> <td style="width: 75%; text-align: center; padding: 5px;">Further information required to make a decision</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="width: 25%; text-align: center; padding: 5px;"></td> <td style="width: 75%; text-align: center; padding: 5px;">Defer</td> </tr> </table>	Initial Status	Proceed to full hurdle criteria appraisal	Financial Sustainability?	Discard from further consideration		Further information required to make a decision		Defer	☐ ☐ ☐ ☒
	Initial Status	Proceed to full hurdle criteria appraisal								
	Financial Sustainability?	Discard from further consideration								
		Further information required to make a decision								
		Defer								
Equalities cleared? (Y/N)										
Option:	143. Introduce a Nucleus Crew Hub at Whitburn to support local OC availability. Consider with Option 018 Bathgate and Option ### Shotts (WSDA).	SDA: East								
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <th style="width: 25%; padding: 5px;">Initial Status</th> <th style="width: 75%; padding: 5px;">Proceed to full hurdle criteria appraisal</th> </tr> <tr> <td style="width: 25%; text-align: center; padding: 5px;">Financial Sustainability?</td> <td style="width: 75%; text-align: center; padding: 5px;">Discard from further consideration</td> </tr> </table>	Initial Status	Proceed to full hurdle criteria appraisal	Financial Sustainability?	Discard from further consideration	☐ ☐				
	Initial Status	Proceed to full hurdle criteria appraisal								
Financial Sustainability?	Discard from further consideration									

			Further information required to make a decision	☐
			Defer	☒
			Equalities cleared? (Y/N)	
Consensus Discussions (record key points only)				
Defer both. None are RAAC so no urgency. Consider phasing. Would represent 16 personnel across 3 locations. Bathgate DSDS 2 nd would not be best value. In isolation it costs money hence why grey. Need to specify days and times. 9-6 is hardest to crew.				
2 DSDS models being discussed. Nucleus crewing may mean no change to on call. Would impact retainer fee and shouts.				
Further information required for decision (record all)				
Clarify point made by Garry around wording should read Increase Bathgate 2nd Pump duty system from OC to DSDS/OC.				
Balance sheet needed for next stage at configuration level?				

Option:	032. Introduce a Nucleus Crew Hub at Broxburn 1 Pump OC station to support local OC availability.		SDA: East
032	Initial Status		Proceed to full hurdle criteria appraisal
	Financial Sustainability?	Modernisation?	Discard from further consideration
			Further information required to make a decision
			Defer
			Equalities cleared? (Y/N)
Consensus Discussions (record key points only)			
Agreed to Defer.			

Further information required for decision (record all)				
Should read BAU recommendation is to replace....				

Option: 118	118. Withdraw Peebles 2 nd OC Pump. Support on-call availability from local Nucleus Crew Hub. Consider with Option 072 Galashiels & Hawick.	SDA: East				
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 30%; padding: 5px;">Initial Status</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">Proceed to full hurdle criteria appraisal</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;"></td> <td style="padding: 5px; text-align: right;">☐</td> </tr> </table>	Initial Status	Proceed to full hurdle criteria appraisal		☐	
Initial Status	Proceed to full hurdle criteria appraisal					
	☐					
Financial Sustainability?	Modernisation?	Discard from further consideration				
	2	Further information required to make a decision				
		Defer				
		☒				
		Equalities cleared? (Y/N)				
Consensus Discussions (record key points only)						
Modelling says one pump is sufficient. Nucleus crew isn't relevant. LSO management team suggested it was an over provision. Unlocks capacity for nucleus crew hub. 2 nd pump response guaranteed from other stations. Agreed to defer. Pare option back to: Withdraw Peebles 2 nd OC Pump. The withdrawal still stands on its own. Support on call/ nucleus would be a wider improvement. Including nucleus crew in options complicates matters at this stage.						
Further information required for decision (record all)						
Remove extra text and fix numbering error. Option number stated as 032 but it is actually 118.						

Option:	072. Reduce Hawick 1 st WT Pump crewing to DSDS/OC.			SDA: East
072	Introduce a Nucleus Crew Hub at Galashiels. Consider with Option 118 Peebles.			
	Initial Status		Proceed to full hurdle criteria appraisal	☒
	Financial Sustainability?	Modernisation?	Discard from further consideration	☐
			Further information required to make a decision	☐
	Equalities cleared? (Y/N)			
	Consensus Discussions (record key points only)			
	Keep in because it is green and green 5. This is RAAC and it is an enabler.			
	Further information required for decision (record all)			
	Do they have to come as a pair? Possibly not but it's a benefit?			
	Get David to explain the redistribution shift for formal hurdle criteria workshop.			

Option:	031. Close either Bridge of Allan Station or Doune Station .			SDA: East
031	Relocate OC crew to Dunblane .			
	Initial Status		Proceed to full hurdle criteria appraisal	☐
	Financial Sustainability?	Modernisation?	Discard from further consideration	☒
		2	Further information required to make a decision	☐

	Equalities cleared? (Y/N)
Consensus Discussions (record key points only)	
Seems like a standalone – what would it save versus what it would achieve. Not saying never – don't look at it now. Negligible financial benefit.	
Further information required for decision (record all)	
Would it be better to mark attraction and retention down to avoid optimism bias? Neutral and undetermined. Fix typos. Also capture this for Marionville. Amend Bridge of Allan to show it is more optimal?	

Option:	032. Introduce a Nucleus Crew Hub at Callander 1 Pump OC station to support local OC availability.		SDA: East
032 / 035	Initial Status		Proceed to full hurdle criteria appraisal
	Financial Sustainability?	Modernisation?	Discard from further consideration
			Further information required to make a decision
			Defer
			Equalities cleared? (Y/N)
Consensus Discussions (record key points only)			
Requires further investigation – defer. Is this actually 035?			
Further information required for decision (record all)			
Check numbering – should be 035?			

Option:	046. Close the Long-Term Dormant 1 Pump OC station at Crianlarich .	SDA: East
----------------	--	-----------

046	Consider with Option 140 Tyndrum, below.			
	Initial Status		Proceed to full hurdle criteria appraisal	☒
	Financial Sustainability?	Modernisation?	Discard from further consideration	☐
		2	Further information required to make a decision	☐
			Defer	☐
	Equalities cleared? (Y/N)			
Consensus Discussions (record key points only)				
No counter arguments. To remain in for next round as currently dormant and no employees there.				
Further information required for decision (record all)				

Option: 140	140. Introduce a Nucleus Crew Hub at Tyndrum 1 Pump OC station to support local OC availability.			SDA: East
	Consider with Option 46 Crianlarich, above.			
	Initial Status		Proceed to full hurdle criteria appraisal	☐
	Financial Sustainability?	Modernisation?	Discard from further consideration	☐
			Further information required to make a decision	☐
			Defer	☒
Equalities cleared? (Y/N)				

Consensus Discussions (record key points only)
Defer this specific option however it relates to closure of Crianlarich which is a dormant station (super criteria).
Further information required for decision (record all)



Thank You

asv

Insight | Change | Management

| info@asv-online.co.uk |



Insight | Change | Management



North & West SDA Technical Reviews

Report

16 October 2024

Contents

1	INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1	Introduction	1
1.1.1	Indicative Scoring	2
2	SUMMARY OF OUTCOMES	3
2.1	Summary of Proceedings	3
2.2	Options to Proceed (retained)	5
3	ADDITIONAL DISCUSSION	9
3.1	Review of criteria to be used for the next stage, hurdle appraisal	9
3.2	Quality of the appraisal process	9
	APPENDIX ONE: REVIEW NOTES	10

Document	SFRS North & West SDA Technical Review		
Version	V2.1	Date	16 October 24
Status	FINAL		

1 INTRODUCTION

Background and Context

1.1 Introduction

The document summarises the proceedings of the Senior Leaders Workshops for the Strategic Service Review Programme (SSRP) held on September 23 & 24, 2024, at the National Headquarters of the Scottish Fire and Rescue Service in Cambuslang.

The potential scenarios for change under consideration in this workshop were related to the North (23rd) and West (24th) Service Delivery Areas (SDA). It was decided to also revisit the options retained from the East Senior Leaders Workshop of 15th August to sense check against the Strategic Priority Options.

Following the discussion of 15 August and the identification of the strategic service priorities the SSRP Programme Board agreed that, due to the large number of options that still required to be reviewed, that future events for the North and West would only consider those options which met the strategic priorities. All other options will be deferred for consideration for a second tranche of engagement at a later date.

All decision makers invited to take part in this initial appraisal were provided with the following information in advance of the workshops:

- A background to the way the options have been developed.
- A description of the criteria to be considered for this technical exercise to reduce a) the list of options under the Strategic Priority list, and b) the very-long list (SDA options) to a manageable size for full hurdle criteria appraisal.
- An explanation of the role of decision makers and that of the subject matter experts¹ who were present to support the process.
- An explanation of the change options provided in the Strategic Priority Options for both the North and West.
- An explanation of the change options provided in the Service Delivery Area Options, for both North and West, the very-long lists.
 - The Equality and Human Rights Impact Assessment.

This was supported by appendices:

1. Pre-hurdle Criteria – Financial Sustainability and Modernisation
2. Station Information and Options Framework
3. Mapping Key

¹ Subject Matter Experts also received a copy of the information in advance of the workshop.

1.1.1 Indicative Scoring

Each option was given a provisional score on the following basis:

	Criterion is considered to be met based on the evidence and balance of strengths and weaknesses.
	Criterion is NOT considered to be met based on the evidence and balance of strengths and weaknesses.
	Criterion is undecided and requires further investigation, application of a strategic principal or strategic prioritisation.

2 SUMMARY OF OUTCOMES

The key results and observations from the North and West SDA reviews

2.1 Summary of Proceedings

The two workshops' primary objective was the (internal to SFRS) application of two of the agreed pre-hurdle criteria to identified Strategic Priority Options from a very long list of service delivery proposals, to reduce the number of options to a manageable level for hurdle appraisal.

The meeting was attended by senior leaders and decision-makers across various departments. These included the Deputy Chief Officer, Directors of Finance, Operational Delivery, Training, Safety and Assurance, Prevention, Protection and Preparedness, and Strategic Planning, among others.

The decision makers were supported by subject matter experts across different domains, from the team responsible for developing the technical proposals; Finance; Comms and Engagement; Legal Services; Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI); and Facilities/Assets Management.

The workshops were to review the North and West Service Delivery Areas (SDA) and review decisions from the East SDA (from 15th August) against the Strategic Priority Options, applying higher level (or pre-hurdle) criteria to narrow down a large number of options to a manageable list for hurdle appraisal.

The process was guided by an independent facilitator from ASV with significant experience in consultation and lead by Mark Loynd, Area Commander. A structured approach was adopted where each option was given time for discussion and consensus reached among the decision makers. Those consensus decisions focused on retention, deferral or elimination of the options. Prior to reviewing the options Ijaz Bashir, Head of Asset Management, provided a financial and assets insight and sense check to aid the consideration process.

Decision makers operated under the agreement of 15 August that any potential solutions that were deferred might come back into play if the retained options were insufficient on their own in forming 'configurations'. If they do not come back into play by the time SFRS goes to consultation they should be regarded as excluded.

Likewise, decision makers also agreed that excluded options were omitted from consideration on the understanding that they might be revisited should circumstances change and/or new evidence come to light that warrants a change of status.

The options were reviewed against the following criterion:

- **STRATEGIC PRIORITY:** Does the option meet strategic priorities?
- **FINANCIAL SUSTAINABILITY:** Does the option contribute to long-term financial sustainability in terms of capital and/or resource budget costs?

- **MODERNISATION:** (i) Does the option contribute to the modernisation of the Service as outlined in the Programme vision? (ii) Does it achieve at least one of the following?
 - Contributes to increasing organisational capacity and/or better use of our resources and facilities.
 - Address issues regarding the attraction and retention of staff.
 - Enhance community safety including through prevention and preparedness.

Consideration was also given to equalities and human rights impact implications of the proposals, notably if there were any associated concerns or high-level adverse impacts for communities and protected characteristic groups.

The discussions in the workshops provided consideration of the extent to which there were immediate priorities:

- Assets with RAAC panels.
- Locations affected by the temporary pump withdrawal in 2023.
- Locations which have not been able to mobilise a crew for several years (dormant stations).

A fourth priority was agreed in relation to specific options relating to the former legacy Grampian service and its use of 10 crew cabs which cannot be replaced.

Consideration extended to which options should be part of a 'second phase' and therefore not to go forward at this stage.

The key decisions:

1. From review of North SDA proposals saw the retention of 14 options across 9 configurations.
2. From review of West SDA proposals saw 16 options across 9 configurations.
3. From review of East SDA proposals saw revision to the retention of 7 options across 4 configurations.

These are presented in summary in the next section.

2.2 Options to Proceed (retained)

The options selected to proceed following deliberation to achieve consensus are shown in the tables below.

North SDA

Option	Description	Priority	Config
86	Rebuild Huntly Station (RAAC) on a new near-optimal site as a 2 Pump OC+OC Station with Nucleus Crew Hub to improve local on-call pump availability and enhance the delivery of supporting activities.	RAAC and 10 CREW CAB	1
120	Reduce Peterhead from a 2 Pump WT+OC station to a 2 Pump DSDS/OC+OC station.		
139	Reduce Turriff Station from a 2 Pump OC (equivalent) station to a 1 Pump OC station.		
034	Close Cullen Station 1 Pump OC station. AND Maintain Buckie as 2 Pump OC+OC station.	10 CREW CAB	2
011	Reduce Ballater Station from a 2 Pump OC (equivalent) to 1 Pump OC Hub station with specialist wildfire capability. Consider in conjunction with either Option 013 or Option 134 below.	10 CREW CAB	3
013	Close Balmoral and/or Strathdon 1 Pump OC stations. Consider in conjunction with Option 011 above.		
134	Reconfigure the Balmoral and/or Strathdon 1 Pump OC stations as minimum requirement satellite stations with ultralightweight pump. Consider in conjunction with Option 011 above.		
119	Replace 3rd WT Pump (CARP) at Perth with a dedicated HRA. Relocate released WT employees.	TEMP	4
147.1	Maintain Kingsway as a 2 Pump WT station. Reduce Balmossie 2 Pump WT+OC station to a 1 Pump OC Station.	TEMP	5
147.2	Maintain Kingsway as a 2 Pump WT station. Close Balmossie 2 Pump WT+OC station.	DORMANT	6
069	Close Fetlar 1 Pump OC RDS long-term dormant station due to crew sustainability challenges		
112	Close a long-term dormant 1 Pump OC VDS station at Nethy Bridge.	DORMANT	7
124	Close the Long-Term Dormant 1 Pump OC VDS station at Ratagan.	DORMANT	8
109	Close the Long-Term Dormant 1 Trailer OC VDS station on the Isle of Muck.	DORMANT	9
14	TOTALS		9

West SDA

Option	Description	Priority	Config
092	Close Kerrera (Dormant) 1 Ultralight Appliance OC VDS Station.	DORMANT	1
040	Close Colintrave (Long-Term Dormant) 1 Pump OC VDS station.	DORMANT	2
083	Reduce Helensburgh (RAAC) from a 2 Pump WT+OC station to a 2 Pump DSDS/OC+OC station.	RAAC	3
023 023.1	Defer for now - Merge Bishopbriggs 1 Pump WT station and Springburn 2 Pump WT station into a new 2 Pump WT station at a near-optimised location. Consider with Option 094 below. NEW - Introduce remove pump from Springburn from 2WT Pump to 1WT Pump – (balanced against narrative of Maryhill temp withdrawal (152))	TEMP	4
44.1	Close Cowcaddens 2 Pump WT station and expand the Calton complex to accommodate the Glasgow City LSO management team. AND Increase Yorkhill from a 1 WT Pump station to a 2 Pump WT station.		
44.2	Rebuild Cowcaddens 2 Pump WT station on the adjacent SFRS owned Maitland Street site and expand the Calton complex to accommodate the Glasgow City LSO management team. AND Close Yorkhill 1 Pump WT Station.		
107	Reduce Milngavie 1 Pump WT station to a 1 Pump DSDS/OC station. AND Repair RAAC at current Milngavie site or rebuild station at a near-optimal location. Standalone option but include in above configuration.		
153	Remove 1 pump from Govan – NEW option Build in longer term narrative.	TEMP	5
079	Reduce Greenock from a 3 Pump WT+WT+OC station to a 2 Pump WT+OC+ dedicated HRA station. Consider with Option 081 below.	TEMP	6
081	Reduce Greenock from a 3 Pump WT+WT+OC station to a 2 Pump WT+DSDS/OC + dedicated HRA station. AND Reduce Port Glasgow from a 2 Pump WT+OC to a 2 Pump DSDS/OC+OC. AND Increase Gourock from a 2 Pump OC+OC to a 2 Pump DSDS/OC+OC.		

	Consider with Option 079 above.		
042	Close the Dormant 1 Pump OC VDS station at Corriecravie.	DORMANT	7
049*	Reduce Cumbernauld (RAAC) from 2 Pump WT+WT station to 2 Pump WT+DSDS/OC station.	RAAC	8
021*	REJECT ON CALL ASPECT UNLESS IMPACT ASSESSMENT TELLS US OTHERWISE Reduce Clydesmill from 2 Pump WT+WT station to 2 Pump WT+DSDS/OC station. AND Reduce Hamilton from 2 Pump WT+WT station to 2 Pump WT+DSDS/OC station. AND Increase Bellshill from 1 Pump WT station to 2 Pump WT+DSDS/OC station. Or 151 BELOW	TEMP	9
AMEND 151*	Reduce Hamilton from 2 Pump WT+WT station to 1 Pump WT station (REMOVE CLYDESMILL ELEMENT)		
053	Reduce Lanark from 2 Pump WT+OC to a 2 Pump DSDS/OC+OC station. AND Increase Carluke 1 Pump OC station to a 2 Pump DSDS/OC+OC station. Consider with Option 049, above. Increase Larkhall 1 Pump OC station to a 1 Pump DSDS/OC station.	ENABLER	
099	Introduce a Nucleus Crew Hub at either Douglas or Lesmahagow to support local OC pump availability. Consider with Option 53, above.		
16	TOTALS		9

* It was agreed, on reflection, that options 21, 49 and 151 are interdependent with options 53 and 99, that were not on the Strategic Priority Options list, and that they, together, would be considered within a single configuration.

East SDA (revised)

Option	Description	Priority	Config
104	Close Marionville Station. Relocate 1 WT pump to Newcraighall Station.	RAAC	1

110	Rebuild Tranent Station (RAAC) on a new near optimal site as a 2 Pump WT+OC Station. Close Musselburgh Station and relocate 1 WT Pump to Tranent Station. Dependent on Option 104 (Proceed) above.		
028	Reduce Bo'ness 1st Pump crewing from 5WDS to DSDS+OC. Consider with Option 068 Falkirk (Deferred)	Deferred	N/A
146	Close Linlithgow 1 Pump OC station. Relocate Linlithgow OC crew to Bo'ness. Consider with Option 028 Falkirk (proceed) above	Deferred	N/A
072	Reduce Hawick 1st WT Pump crewing to DSDS/OC. Introduce a Nucleus Crew Hub at Galashiels. Consider with Option 118 Peebles (Deferred).	RAAC	2
046	Close the Long-Term Dormant 1 Pump OC station at Crianlarich. Consider with Option 140 Tyndrum (Deferred)	Dormant	3
061	Replace the Dunfermline 3rd WT Combined Aerial Rescue Pump (CARP) with a dedicated High Reach Appliance (HRA).	TEMP	4
145	Permanently remove the 2nd WT Pump from two of the following three stations: Glenrothes, Lochgelly, Methil		
76/102/106	Now looking at 2 configs round 3 stations. Change 2nd pump to day crewing (remove OC options, unless impact assessments require it to remain in). Reduce Glenrothes 2 Pump WT+WT station to 2 Pump WT+DSDS/OC station. AND (Reduce Lochgelly 2 Pump WT station to 2 Pump WT+DSDS/OC station OR 2 Pump WT+OC station). AND Reduce Methil 2 Pump WT station to 2 Pump WT+DSDS/OC station OR 2 Pump WT+OC station).		
7	TOTALS		4

3 ADDITIONAL DISCUSSION

Impromptu discussion arising from proceedings

3.1 Review of criteria to be used for the next stage, hurdle appraisal

Following appraisal on the 24th and confirmation that participants were content with the outcomes, the facilitator invited the participants to reflect on the criteria that were to be used for the next stage, the hurdle appraisal. This was for two reasons. First, because during consensus appraisal on the 23rd and 24th the deliberations gave indication that the criteria proposed for hurdle appraisal might not adequately incorporate what the participants had identified as important in their considerations. Second, the shift to approaching the programme in phases, with this phase focused on Strategic Priorities.

The facilitator invited participants to reflect on what had been discussed over the two days and then note, individually, what they regarded as the 5 most important measures (criteria) that options should be appraised against at hurdle criteria stage. The facilitator then noted these on the flipchart and recorded the frequency with which participants had noted the same criteria.

It was agreed that this information would be passed to Marysia Waters and Paul Anderson to collate, sense check against the previously agreed criteria and to amend the criteria if needed.

3.2 Quality of the appraisal process

The facilitator, Nicholas Duffin, finished his involvement for the day by complimenting the participants, Mark Loynd (for his facilitation) and Scottish Fire and Rescue Service for the quality of what they had undertaken and their commitment to best practice. When pressed, he confirmed that the process undertaken for pre-hurdle criteria appraisal had been the best he had seen from any FRS.

He then handed over to Stuart Stevens to close the meeting.

APPENDIX ONE: REVIEW NOTES

Scribes record of deliberation to reach consensus on options

Strategic Service Review Programme

Session: Technical Considerations Exercise

Date: 23rd September 2024

Venue: SFRS HQ, Cambuslang

Scribe Name: Alicia Mulvey

Option: 086	Rebuild Huntly Station (RAAC) on a new near-optimal site as a 2 Pump OC+OC Station with Nucleus Crew Hub to improve local on-call pump availability and enhance the delivery of supporting activities.			Proceed to full hurdle criteria appraisal	SDA: North
	Initial Status				☒
	Financial Sustainability?	Modernisation?		Discard from further consideration	☐
				Further information required to make a decision (record requirement below)	☐
	Equalities cleared? (Y/N)				
Option: 139	Reduce Turriff Station from a 2 Pump OC (equivalent) to 1 Pump OC.			SDA:	North
	Initial Status			Proceed to full hurdle criteria appraisal	☒
	Financial Sustainability?	Modernisation?		Discard from further consideration	☐
				Further information required to make a decision (record requirement below)	☐
	Equalities cleared? (Y/N)				
Option:	120. Reduce Peterhead Station 1st Pump crewing from WT to DSDS/OC.			SDA:	North
	Initial Status			Proceed to full hurdle criteria appraisal	☒
	Financial Sustainability?	Modernisation?		Discard from further consideration	☐
				Further information required to make a decision (record requirement below)	☐
	Equalities cleared? (Y/N)				

Consensus Discussions (record key points only)

Option 86

A summary of the current position of Huntly given by the Property team. Update provided that a site is required for the station with seven potential sites identified. Huntly is a prime central location. The layout and occupation of the station needs to be agreed on for the station for the Property team to move forward. Confirmation required on whether Huntly will have a nucleus crew. Welfare unit special based here.

Definition of nucleus crewing provided. Nucleus crewing can mean different things in different localities. Training requirements with nucleus hubs need to be considered. Training considerations on competencies to be considered with the options. Wholetime change to be reviewed. Nucleus crew example given for Hawick\Borders and the different setup. Example provided of an area configuration change and the associated skillsets and competencies that need to be considered as these need to be effectively retained. The principle of having nucleus crews may be positively received by LSOs.

The pipeline of configurations across other options to be reviewed. This option has the same number of vehicles at the station but provides a reduction in the crew numbers. The option is difficult to present to the public via consultation, framing a change of resource is often difficult. If the option is to remove, then a non-standard – 10 seat Cab may provide better standardisation. In terms of asset standardisation there is a point for supporting removal of these.

For the hurdle criteria firefighter safety is green, but for the red ones e.g. partnership working could be ok. Bring this option in scope with the Peterhead configuration changes.

Building work has been identified as required on the site. If the building work is included in the plan, does it need to be consulted on? There may be a reduction in the number of pumps.

The circumstances of the options may change, we may have assumed that it will be positively received. This is a new model for new personnel involved, there may be redeployment of personnel to different stations. Agreement that this may not be a site that needs to be consulted on. If it is part of the configuration and there may be movement of personnel, it needs to be considered and there may be resistance. This option may need to be considered in relation to the Peterhead option.

Huntly has been kept because it included a Nucleus Crew Hub in addition to the current 2 OC Pumps plus welfare unit. Huntly is also linked to Peterhead and Turriff as a mitigation for reductions.

Option 139

It is likely to reduce the station personnel numbers and reduce the resource. There is not a reduction in vehicles with this option. There is a 50/50 split in terms of call outs requiring a two pump turn out. Historically when the crew were available this station would run as a two-pump station. It is the stations discretion as to how many people ride the pump. The ability to communicate to the public that one fire engine is completing the job of two fire engines may be challenging. Control makes the decision to mobilise the pump as a single resource. If there is an opportunity to not have a ten-crew cab as a standard it may be beneficial for Asset Management. To some people stations will be considered by default a two-pump station. Once this option is impact assessed it may not be an option for consultation.

Further information required for decision (record all)

7 sites, layout tbc, nucleus crew facilities for design. What is meant by nucleus crewing, office base to distribute from?

Does this need to go to consultation, and should this be re-presented as a single option with Turriff and Peterhead?

Configure options 86/139/120 into one configuration.

Option: 034	Close Cullen Station and redeploy crew to maintain Buckie as 2 Pump OC station.			SDA: North
	Initial Status	Proceed to full hurdle criteria appraisal		☒
	Financial Sustainability?	Modernisation?	Discard from further consideration	☐
			Further information required to make a decision (record requirement below)	☐
	Equalities cleared? (Y/N)			

Consensus Discussions (record key points only)

Cullen has difficulties recruiting personnel and Buckie provides support when Cullen is not available. Buckie is the second biggest populace. Cullen could be moved on a phased basis, to Buckie or Portsoy. The phased response element would apply to Cullen. Cullen is a two-bay station, and it would need a full refurb due to its age and condition. The refurb can be completed later, the change can be progressed prior to the refurb being completed.

Some wider North coast options including BanffMacDuff could also be developed and tabled but they potentially require a refurbishment. Resilience left in the area with this option. It is a good news story but could be completed as the 2nd tranche of changes as part of a wider configuration.

Further information required for decision (record all)

Discussion on Banff and MacDuff as part of the configuration of Buckie/ Cullen. Discussion on whether to close Banff, not part of the current options. Some of the options have been removed that may assist with the capital backlog. The more options taken forward increase the timeline. What is a manageable number of options to consider with the associated work required? The longer the list of options the higher the risk within consultation. Discussion on the approach to reviewing the options undertaken, the immediate priorities, the long-term vision should be considered.

Recruitment issues with the Station Commanders each week spending a lot of time recruiting vacancies. Challenges are going to be provided locally rather than via the SDA. Should the options be reviewed by an LSO area?

Option: 011	011: Reduce Ballater Station from a 2 Pump OC (equivalent) to 1 Pump OC Hub station with specialist wildfire capability. Consider in conjunction with either Option 013 or Option 134.		SDA: North
	Initial Status	Proceed to full hurdle criteria appraisal	
	Financial Sustainability?	Modernisation?	Discard from further consideration
			Further information required to make a decision (record requirement below)
	Equalities cleared? (Y/N)		
Option: 013	Close Balmoral and/or Strathdon 1 Pump OC stations. Consider in conjunction with Option 011 above.		
	Initial Status	Proceed to full hurdle criteria appraisal	
	Financial Sustainability?	Modernisation?	Discard from further consideration
			Further information required to make a decision (record requirement below)
	Equalities cleared? (Y/N)		
Option: 134	Reconfigure the Balmoral and/or Strathdon 1 Pump OC stations as minimum requirement satellite stations with ultra-lightweight pump. Consider in conjunction with Option 011 above.		
	Initial Status	Proceed to full hurdle criteria appraisal	
	Financial Sustainability?	Modernisation?	Discard from further consideration
			Further information required to make a decision (record requirement below)
	Equalities cleared? (Y/N)		
Consensus Discussions (record key points only) Option 011 These stations could be reconfigured differently. The ten crew cab to a single pump could be seen as a reduction. This is a specialist resource. The five personnel may have wildfire speciality. Transportation and crewing the pumps are the key things. Questions raised on whether this option needs to be consulted on or whether it is considered an operational change. The option feels more like an operational change, as opposed to Public Consultation. Ballater station is carrying five vacancies. This option releases capacity by not recruiting the vacancies. The station is not currently mobilising as a nine or ten body station. Other personnel could be mobilised in a separate vehicle. Current ten crew cab will need replaced due to its age. There would be a change in policy if we mobilise a 4x4 alongside a pump (what are the implications of this?) Test of internal and external implications required to decide whether consultation of the option is required. Consideration of the political implications also required. Complete tests with members of the public, can we pre-test based on feedback. Strathdon is only in scope as a nucleus arrangement. Option 013 Strathdon requires a new build for BAU, and a nucleus crew could be accommodated in a new build but not the current building.			

Would these options be ruled out if option 011 is proceeded? Do we allow the change in numbers to manage themselves or do we actively complete this? Could grey be used for neutral in the hurdle criteria?
Option 134

If the pump capacity is dropped at Ballater then Balmoral may be impacted as Balmoral is Ballater's closest station for providing cover. This option would require consultation. Balmoral belongs to estate and no available options for reconfiguration extension or new build.
How do we provide the second pump? The process of picking out the strategic priority and the ten cab may mean other options within the wider pack of options will not be considered.

Preferred options are Balmoral and Ballater. Strathdon is more likely to be the option that is dropped.

Further information required for decision (record all)

Consider alongside options 13 and 134.

Option: 119	Replace 3rd WT Pump (CARP) at Perth with a dedicated HRA. Relocate released WT employees.		SDA: North
	Initial Status	Proceed to full hurdle criteria appraisal	☒
	Financial Sustainability?	Modernisation?	☐
		Discard from further consideration	☐
		Further information required to make a decision (record requirement below)	☐
Equalities cleared? (Y/N)			
Consensus Discussions (record key points only)			
There are concerns around resilience reducing the three pumps to a two pump, however the concern is mitigated with on call and Dundee. BAU requirements would be a dedicated HRA and two pumps. The temporary situation is ok.			
Further information required for decision (record all)			

Option: 014.1	014.1 Close Kingsway 2 Pump WT station and Balmossie 2 Pump WT+OC station. Build a replacement 2 Pump WT+WT station at a near-optimal location in the Claypotts area.		SDA: North
	Initial Status	Proceed to full hurdle criteria appraisal	☐
	Financial Sustainability?	Modernisation?	☐
		Discard from further consideration	☐
		Further information required to make a decision (record requirement below)	☐
Equalities cleared? (Y/N)			
Defer			
Equalities cleared? (Y/N)			
Option:	Close Kingsway 2 Pump WT station and Balmossie 2 Pump WT+OC station.		

014.2	Build a replacement 2 Pump WT+DSDS/OC station at a near-optimal location in the Claypotts area.		
	Initial Status		Proceed to full hurdle criteria appraisal ☐
	Financial Sustainability?	Modernisation?	Discard from further consideration ☐
			Further information required to make a decision (record requirement below) ☐
			Defer ☒
Equalities cleared? (Y/N)			
Option: 014.3	014.3 Close Kingsway 2 Pump WT station and Balmossie 2 Pump station. Build a replacement 3 Pump WT +WT +OC station at a new location in the Claypotts area.		
	Initial Status		Proceed to full hurdle criteria appraisal ☐
	Financial Sustainability?	Modernisation?	Discard from further consideration ☐
			Further information required to make a decision (record requirement below) ☐
			Defer ☒
Equalities cleared? (Y/N)			
Consensus Discussions (record key points only) The first three options are based on a site being available. There is land in the area, however, there has not been any specific site searches completed. Balmossie is a residential site that may have a capital receipt. Differences in costs between the three claypot configurations. Claypotts would assist with response times. This could be reviewed in three stages; first step is to establish whether one of the pumps is not required. If the occupancy is reduced a new station will not need to be built. 147.1 is the option now then 14.3 is the working point for this as it is a better position. This option is based on a site being available. Thoughts around removing 2 stations, costing £6 million each, totally £12m to bring the two stations up to standard or alternatively investing £10million for a purpose-built station. Further information required for decision (record all)			

Option: 147.1	Maintain Kingsway as a 2 Pump WT station. Reduce Balmossie 2 Pump WT+OC station to a 1 Pump OC Station.			SDA: North
	Initial Status	Proceed to full hurdle criteria appraisal		
	Financial Sustainability?	Modernisation?	Discard from further consideration	
			Further information required to make a decision (record requirement below)	
	Equalities cleared? (Y/N)			
Option: 147.2	147.2 Maintain Kingsway as a 2 Pump WT station. Reduce Balmossie 2 Pump WT+OC station to a 1 Pump OC Station.			
	Initial Status	Proceed to full hurdle criteria appraisal		
	Financial Sustainability?	Modernisation?	Discard from further consideration	
			Further information required to make a decision (record requirement below)	
	Equalities cleared? (Y/N)			
Consensus Discussions (record key points only) 147.1 may be the only option just now. This will release five permanent watch commanders from Balmossie. This option reduces 5WC's. 147.2 may not make it through as it does not improve any desirability but should be considered further. 147.2 is the preferred option and has been kept in as a fallback option. Further information required for decision (record all)				

Option: BAU	Replace the Perth 3rd WT Pump (CARP) with 3rd Pump and dual crewed HRA.			SDA: North
	Initial Status	Proceed to full hurdle criteria appraisal		☐
	Financial Sustainability?	Modernisation?	Discard from further consideration	☒
			Further information required to make a decision (record requirement below)	☐
	Equalities cleared? (Y/N)			
Consensus Discussions (record key points only) Progressed option 119. Further information required for decision (record all)				
Option: 069	Close Fethar 1 Pump OC RDS long-term dormant station due to crew sustainability challenges.			SDA: North
	Initial Status	Proceed to full hurdle criteria appraisal		☒
	Financial Sustainability?	Modernisation?	Discard from further consideration	☐
			Further information required to make a decision	☐
	Equalities cleared? (Y/N)			
Consensus Discussions (record key points only) The station is dormant in terms of activity and there is a declining population in the area. Further information required for decision (record all)				
Option: 112	Close a long-term dormant 1 Pump OC VDS station at Nethy Bridge.			SDA: North
	Initial Status	Proceed to full hurdle criteria appraisal		☒
	Financial Sustainability?	Modernisation?	Discard from further consideration	☐
			Further information required to make a decision	☐
	Equalities cleared? (Y/N)			
Consensus Discussions (record key points only) There is no station, vehicle, or personnel. Further information required for decision (record all)				
Option: 123	Replace 1 Pump OC (RAAC) station at Portree with 1 Pump OC Station, Nucleus Hub, Training and Overnight Accommodation. Introduce a Nucleus Crew Hub at Portree to improve local on-call pump availability.			SDA: North

	Initial Status			Proceed to full hurdle criteria appraisal	☐
	Financial Sustainability?	Modernisation?		Discard from further consideration	☒
				Further information required to make a decision	☐
	Equalities cleared? (Y/N)				
Consensus Discussions (record key points only) Review the configuration of Skye. It may be worth addressing the whole Skye scenario in one go based on signpost and tranche e.g. Local Plans. There is a site currently in negotiations. Questions on whether staffing is required in Uig. There are only approximately three staff on the run. The current location may not be available long term as we may be evicted from the current site provided by CalMac ferries. We own another site in Uig. Consultation would be required to consult on what SFRS is going to do based on the need to vacate from the sheds provided from CalMac. Arguable given Uig issue, EHRIA impact assessment required. Further information required for decision (record all) This will happen without consultation as part of BAU. Portree and Uig happening anyway through CRH pilot so discard from hurdle criteria workshop.					

Option: 124	Close the Long-Term Dormant 1 Pump OC VDS station at Ratanan.			SDA: North
	Initial Status			☒
	Financial Sustainability?	Modernisation?		☐
				☐
Equalities cleared? (Y/N)			Further information required to make a decision	
Consensus Discussions (record key points only) Long term dormant, there are no personnel or vehicles there. Further information required for decision (record all)				

Option: 109	Close the Long-Term Dormant 1 Trailer OC VDS station on the Isle of Muck.			SDA: North
	Initial Status		Proceed to full hurdle criteria appraisal	
	Financial Sustainability?	Modernisation?	Discard from further consideration	
			Further information required to make a decision (record requirement below)	
	Equalities cleared? (Y/N)			
Consensus Discussions (record key points only) Volunteers come from each of the small isles. There is no station. Further information required for decision (record all)				
Option: 025	Introduce a Nucleus Crew Hub at Blairgowrie to improve local on-call pump availability.			SDA: North
	Initial Status		Proceed to full hurdle criteria appraisal	
	Financial Sustainability?	Modernisation?	Discard from further consideration	
			Further information required to make a decision	
	Defer			
	Equalities cleared? (Y/N)			
Consensus Discussions (record key points only) Further information required for decision (record all)				

Option: 043	Close Coupar Angus 1 Pump OC station and relocate on-call crew to Blairgowrie or Alyth.		SDA: North
	Initial Status		Proceed to full hurdle criteria appraisal ☐
	Financial Sustainability?	Modernisation?	Discard from further consideration ☐
			Further information required to make a decision ☐
			Defer ☒
Equalities cleared? (Y/N)			
Consensus Discussions (record key points only) We do not have the crew in Angus. Further information required for decision (record all)			

Strategic Service Review Programme

Session: Technical Considerations Exercise
 Date: 24th September 2024
 Venue: SFRS HQ, Cambuslang
 Scribe Name: Alicia Mulvey

Option: 092	Close Kerrera (Dormant) 1 Ultralight Appliance OC VDS Station.		SDA: West
	Initial Status		Proceed to full hurdle criteria appraisal
	Financial Sustainability?	Modernisation?	Discard from further consideration
			Further information required to make a decision
	Equalities cleared? (Y/N)		
Consensus Discussions (record key points only) Volunteer station on a small island. The station has not been crewed for several years. The reds can mean no change, in this example the red hurdle criteria refer to a status quo. Kerrera can be covered by Oban. Further information required for decision (record all) Action to adjust reds to amber or grey to indicate no change.			

Option: 040	Close Colintraive (Long-Term Dormant) 1 Pump OC VDS station.		SDA: West
	Initial Status		Proceed to full hurdle criteria appraisal
	Financial Sustainability?	Modernisation?	Discard from further consideration
			Further information required to make a decision
	Equalities cleared? (Y/N)		
Consensus Discussions (record key points only) Colintraive is a mainland, dormant, on call, volunteer station. There have not been any incidents for five years. Further information required for decision (record all)			

Option: 083	Reduce Helensburgh (RAAC) from a 2 Pump WT+OC station to a 2 Pump DSDS/OC+OC station.		Proceed to full hurdle criteria appraisal	SDA: West
	Initial Status		☒	
	Financial Sustainability?	Modernisation?	Discard from further consideration	☐
			Further information required to make a decision	☐
Equalities cleared? (Y/N) Consensus Discussions (record key points only) This station has political challenges and potentially some public consultation challenges. Change in duty system to day crewing. There are some considerations around risks and demand in this area. The perception of risks is the issue, but RAAC means this station needs to be addressed. Historically it was a retained station. Advised crewing models around Nuclear Power Stations and OC Duty covering these. Where this sits in the priority pipeline in terms of RAAC is a key consideration. There is a site identified near the town. The station cannot be reconfigured until the crewing model is decided on. The roof can be fixed, and the beds can be kept. If the decision cannot be made within 5 years, then it would move into the pipeline. Where does this option sit in the priority of the RAAC stations? Further information required for decision (record all)				
Option: 023	Merge Bishopbriggs 1 Pump WT station and Springburn 2 Pump WT station into a new 2 Pump WT station at a near-optimised location. Consider with Option 094.		Proceed to full hurdle criteria appraisal	SDA: West
	Initial Status		☒	
	Financial Sustainability?	Modernisation?	Discard from further consideration	☐
			Further information required to make a decision	☐
Equalities cleared? (Y/N) Close Cowcaddens 2 Pump WT station and expand the Calton complex to accommodate the Glasgow City LSO management team. AND Increase Yorkhill from a 1 WT Pump station to a 2 Pump WT station.				
Option: 044.1	Initial Status		Proceed to full hurdle criteria appraisal	☒
	Financial Sustainability?	Modernisation?	Discard from further consideration	☐
			Further information required to make a decision	☐
	Equalities cleared? (Y/N)			
Option: 044.2	044-2. Rebuild Cowcaddens 2 Pump WT station on the adjacent SFRS owned Maitland Street site and expand the Calton complex to accommodate the Glasgow City LSO management team.			
	AND			

Close Yorkhill 1 Pump WT Station.			
	Initial Status		Proceed to full hurdle criteria appraisal
	Financial Sustainability?	Modernisation?	Discard from further consideration
			Further information required to make a decision
	Equalities cleared? (Y/N)		
Option: 107	Reduce Milngavie 1 Pump WT station to a 1 Pump DSDS/OC station. AND Repair RAAC at current Milngavie site or rebuild station at a near-optimal location.		
	Initial Status		Proceed to full hurdle criteria appraisal
	Financial Sustainability?	Modernisation?	Discard from further consideration
			Further information required to make a decision
	Equalities cleared? (Y/N)		
Consensus Discussions (record key points only) Option 23 makes sense in terms of the risk and demand. However, Land Premium for a site is a key consideration and is challenging. This station is not on the list for Property builds (within the next 5 years) however, the option could be revised and split. Remove pump from Springburn and move to Maryhill. In effect restating the temporary withdrawal of the pump withdrawal at Maryhill and then consult on the removal of the pump at Springburn. There is the option to take an alternative appliance away and reconfigure Cowcaddens and Maryhill. This option could be split into a 23.1 and 23.2 to incorporate Springburn on its own as an option as part of the pipeline. There may be political factors to consider where the land is located, depending on the local authority area. How likely are we to get land in the area required and how much will the land cost? There is a potential site at Stobhill hospital near derelict social housing. It would be a few years before the finance is available to build a new station. A risk-based approach for prioritising the spend on a new station needs to be taken. Option 23 is deferred and stood up as a new option 23.1, including 44.1, 44.2 and 107 as a configuration. There is a separate option, 152 for Maryhill. For option 44.1 one viewpoint was to keep this option in to at least cover against hurdle criteria, even if not the preferred option. Possibly even remove Carlton reference as this could increase costs – hurdle criteria negatively and therefore be a negative hurdle straightaway. Staff could be re-distributed to the Glasgow stations. If a slot for property investment was available Cowcaddens would be the preferred option. This option has not been assessed against all hurdle criteria and therefore should this be kept into be assessed further? There must be an option of close or rebuild Cowcaddens as there will be challenges on this option. Yorkhill is a more attractive option from a property perspective. Option 44.2: station noted as a temporary withdrawal station, two pumps should go back into Cowcaddens.			

Option 107: risk and demand modelling indicate this is a solid enough proposal. Some political considerations around consultations and concerns around recruitment. A key consideration is also RAAC. The option will develop through the hurdle criteria – DSDS – OC. There is difficulty recruiting on call firefighters increased with Milngavie being an affluent area. There is the option to recruit internally, dual contract. The configuration for the station refurb needs to be established, is this station to be refurbished to a day duty or wholetime station with the renovation to the RAAC roof. The modelling suggested Milngavie should be retained only, not wholetime. Consultation depends on the duty system decided upon for Milngavie. There is a risk and demand issue in Milngavie. There is a potential risk to the programme if we default to the status quo. This option needs to remain an option due to the RAAC roof being a strategic priority. Response can be provided by Knightswood, Clydebank and Maryhill. This station provides resilience to the West Service Delivery Area.	
Further information required for decision (record all)	
Calton reconfiguration to be removed	

Option: 094	Increase Kirkintilloch 1 Pump WT station to a 2 Pump WT+RDS station. Consider with Option 023.		SDA: West
	Initial Status	Proceed to full hurdle criteria appraisal	
	Financial Sustainability?	Modernisation?	
	Equalities cleared? (Y/N)		
Consensus Discussions (record key points only)			
Do we need an on-call pump at Kirkintilloch? Deferred based on the merger of other Glasgow options noted in the above options (Springburn\Bishopbriggs).			
Further information required for decision (record all)			

Option: 080	Rebuild Govan 2 Pump WT as a 2 Pump WT station at new optimised location. Consider with Options 017 and 039.			SDA: West
	Initial Status		Proceed to full hurdle criteria appraisal	☐
	Financial Sustainability?	Modernisation?	Discard from further consideration	☐
			Further information required to make a decision	☐
			Defer	☒
Equalities cleared? (Y/N)				
Consensus Discussions (record key points only)				
Land value for a new build is a key issue, especially to move the station approximately one mile up the road. This option is dependent on land availability and development plans across the city. Change Option to 80.1 (this is actually Option 153 created as a standalone option for Govan) with this just being a removal of 1 Pump from Govan due to activity. Some considerations overall about Southside of Glasgow, pre-consultation\engagement needed with 3 local authorities. Option is based on moving Govan away from the river. The Yorkhill option does not impact on Govan. If we do not move this station are the Pollock and Barrhead options still viable? If the pump is removed, Pollock becomes more important. If this station is relocated, it becomes two pumps and if it stays where it is it will be a one pump station. It may be more straightforward and financially viable to keep Govan located where it is. If the pump is removed from Govan is there an option to relocate when land becomes available, five years later as a pipeline option? There is the opportunity to create another option 80.a or 80.1 remove one pump permanent from Govan. Option 80 differed but Govan is covered for a 1 pump removal in option 153. This would resolve the temporary pump withdrawal. This option is dependent on Clarkston and Barrhead. Further information required for decision (record all) Option 153 created as a standalone option for Govan.				

Option: 153	Remove 1 pump from Govan		Proceed to full hurdle criteria appraisal		SDA: West
	Initial Status				
	Financial Sustainability?	Modernisation?	Discard from further consideration		
			Further information required to make a decision		
	Equalities cleared? (Y/N)				
Consensus Discussions (record key points only) See comments for option 80. Option 153 created following discussion of option 80 Further information required for decision (record all)					

Option: 017	Merge Barrhead 1 Pump WT station and Pollok 2 Pump WT station as a new 2 Pump WT station at a near-optimised location. Consider with Options 039 and 080.		Proceed to full hurdle criteria appraisal		SDA: West
	Initial Status				
	Financial Sustainability?	Modernisation?	Discard from further consideration		
			Further information required to make a decision		
	Equalities cleared? (Y/N)		Defer		
Consensus Discussions (record key points only) Further information required for decision (record all)					

Option: 039. Reduce Clarkston from a 1 Pump WT station to a 1 Pump DSDS/OC station. Consider with Option 017.	Initial Status		Proceed to full hurdle criteria appraisal	SDA: West
	Financial Sustainability?	Modernisation?	Discard from further consideration	☐
			Further information required to make a decision	☐
			Defer	☒
	Equalities cleared? (Y/N)			
Consensus Discussions (record key points only) Clarkston station is not well located and does not need a wholetime pump. The stations being considered are across three different local authorities. Linked to option 17. Further information required for decision (record all)				

Option: 079	Reduce Greenock from a 3 Pump WT+WT+OC station to a 2 Pump WT+OC+ dedicated HRA station. Consider with Option 081.			SDA: West
	Initial Status		Proceed to full hurdle criteria appraisal	☒
	Financial Sustainability?	Modernisation?	Discard from further consideration	☐
			Further information required to make a decision	☐
	Equalities cleared? (Y/N)			
Option: 081	Reduce Greenock from a 3 Pump WT+WT+OC station to a 2 Pump WT+DSDS/OC + dedicated HRA station. AND Reduce Port Glasgow from a 2 Pump WT+OC to a 2 Pump DSDS/OC+OC. AND Increase Gourrock from a 2 Pump OC+OC to a 2 Pump DSDS/OC+OC. Consider with Option 079 above			
	Initial Status		Proceed to full hurdle criteria appraisal	☒
	Financial Sustainability?	Modernisation?	Discard from further consideration	☐
			Further information required to make a decision (record requirement below)	☐
	Equalities cleared? (Y/N)			

Consensus Discussions (record key points only)

This option is the status quo in terms of the temporary removal and is not doing anything new with the station. A new fire station would need to be backed financially by the Scottish Government. Short term this option can be rebalanced and if the opportunity presents to buy a new site later in the pipeline this can be explored. Model suggests all crews are required across the three fire stations in Inverclyde due to the high level of deprivation in the area and number of high-rise flats. A day crew could assist with prevention work.

Option 081 is a full re-balance in this area. So, 79 v 81 to be compared.

Further information required for decision (record all)

Option: 042	Close the Dormant 1 Pump OC VDS station at Corriecravie.		SDA: West
	Initial Status		Proceed to full hurdle criteria appraisal ☒
	Financial Sustainability?	Modernisation?	Discard from further consideration ☐
			Further information required to make a decision ☐
	Equalities cleared? (Y/N)		
Consensus Discussions (record key points only)			
Difficulties with long term crewing at this station. There have been two incidents in the last five years. Will be covered by Blackwaterfoot, and crew redeployed accordingly.			
Further information required for decision (record all)			

Option: 049	Reduce Cumbernauld (RAAC) from 2 Pump WT+WT station to 2 Pump WT+DSDS/OC station.		SDA: West
	Initial Status		Proceed to full hurdle criteria appraisal ☒
	Financial Sustainability?	Modernisation?	Discard from further consideration ☐
			Further information required to make a decision ☐
	Equalities cleared? (Y/N)		
Consensus Discussions (record key points only)			
The risk and demand activity for this option suggests it makes sense to reduce the crewing model to tackle RAAC panelling. There are challenges finding a site. The crewing model being changed may make addressing the RAAC panelling easier. Property cannot fix the RAAC with a 2 pump wholetime due to the staffing numbers. There are development opportunities for North Lanarkshire local authority area with new housing areas planned. Standalone option for RAAC.			
Further information required for decision (record all)			

Option: 021	Reduce Clydesmill from 2 Pump WT+WT station to 2 Pump WT+DSDS/OC station. AND Reduce Hamilton from 2 Pump WT+WT station to 2 Pump WT+DSDS/OC station. AND Increase Bellshill from 1 Pump WT station to 2 Pump WT+DSDS/OC station.			SDA: West
	Initial Status		Proceed to full hurdle criteria appraisal	
	Financial Sustainability?	Modernisation?	Discard from further consideration	
			Further information required to make a decision	
	Equalities cleared? (Y/N)			
Option: 151	Reduce Hamilton from 2 Pump WT+WT station to 1 Pump WT station. OR Reduce Clydesmill from 2 Pump WT+WT station to 1 Pump WT station.			
	Initial Status		Proceed to full hurdle criteria appraisal	
	Financial Sustainability?	Modernisation?	Discard from further consideration	
			Further information required to make a decision	
	Equalities cleared? (Y/N)			
Option: 53	Reduce Lanark from 2 Pump WT+OC to a 2 Pump DSDS/OC+OC station. AND Increase Carluke 1 Pump OC station to a 2 Pump DSDS/OC+OC station. Consider with Option 049			
	Initial Status		Proceed to full hurdle criteria appraisal	
	Financial Sustainability?	Modernisation?	Discard from further consideration	
			Further information required to make a decision	
	Equalities cleared? (Y/N)			
Option: 99	Introduce a Nucleus Crew Hub at either Douglas or Lesmahagow to support local OC pump availability. Consider with Option 53.			
	Initial Status		Proceed to full hurdle criteria appraisal	
	Financial Sustainability?	Modernisation?	Discard from further consideration	
			Further information required to make a decision	
	Equalities cleared? (Y/N)			
Consensus Discussions (record key points only)				

North Lanarkshire and South Lanarkshire councils have under provision metrics therefore Clydesmill, Hamilton, Bellshill and other considerations need to be balanced with this. Background metrics suggest further work\options to consider. Possible, to consider just DSDS\OC at Bellshill if night metrics support that change.

This option needs to be reconfigured. The Bellshill option is attractive with several special skills provided through this station including water rescue, environmental cover and support for the Glasgow area. There are challenges with recruitment for South Lanarkshire, local authority area. There is an argument for Bellshill in terms of its activity. The Bellshill station could accommodate an additional pump as part of the pipeline with day cover. Day cover would provide support for other stations in the area and free up staff for training and other activities.

Leave Clydesmill, do not reduce as the option states, continue with Hamilton reduction and increase Bellshill. Rejecting on call part of the option, these stations would be day crewed. Remove Clydesmill from option 151 and leave Hamilton only.

An additional vehicle is required.

Lanark nucleus crews provide the possibility to cover the M74 corridor. Modelling suggested Carluke increase but this would require significant financial investment remodelling the station, therefore Lanark considerations being reviewed.

Southern South Lanarkshire M74 considerations should be reviewed as this covers several points – including savings. Strategic value in terms of balancing. This relates back to Hamilton option. The modelling shows that Lanark does not need a wholetime pump. Lanark can be reduced, and the resources can be redistributed to Carluke and Larkhall. Welfare facilities need to be reconfigured for the dignified facilities. 20 staff may be liberated with this option. There are little property implications. This option is not one of the strategic priorities. An understanding of the consultation work for this option is required. Progressing this option would support the pump removal at Hamilton. The option has been added as an enabler and as mitigation for the Hamilton removal.

Further information required for decision (record all)

Reconfiguring this option to take forward the Bellshill increase. 21 and amended 151 keep together.

Option: 007/008	Introduce Nucleus Crew Hubs at Cumnock and Girvan to improve local on-call pump availability and enhance the delivery of supporting activities.			SDA: West	
	Initial Status		Proceed to full hurdle criteria appraisal		☐
	Financial Sustainability?	Modernisation?	Discard from further consideration		☐
			Further information required to make a decision		☐
			Defer		☒
	Equalities cleared? (Y/N)				
Option: 138	Reduce Troon from a 2 Pump OC+OC station to a 1 Pump OC station.				
	Initial Status		Proceed to full hurdle criteria appraisal		☐
	Financial Sustainability?	Modernisation?	Discard from further consideration		☐
			Further information required to make a decision (record requirement below)		☐
			Defer		☒

	Equalities cleared? (Y/N)			
Option: 010	Reduce Ayr from a 3 Pump WT+WT+OC station to a 2 Pump WT+WT station. AND Relocate management and functional employees from Ardrossan to Ayr			
	Initial Status			Proceed to full hurdle criteria appraisal ☐
	Financial Sustainability?	Modernisation?		Discard from further consideration ☐
				Further information required to make a decision (record requirement below) ☐
				Defer ☒
	Equalities cleared? (Y/N)			
Consensus Discussions (record key points only) Change to OC. Overall, a ENSA options with several configurations could be considered. The preferred option is option 007 rather than 008. The condition of Ardrossan station is poor. Ardrossan could be reduced to an on-call pump. The admin staff could be moved to Ayr. Day crewing can be accommodated in Ardrossan. Day crew would release 5 Watch Commanders and additional crew. If option 007 cannot be achieved, then option 008 would make sense. Kilwinning suggests as a Day Option due to lack of bedroom facilities. This could be put into Pipeline, as potentially saves money long term. The option could be deferred and flagged in 12 months. Further information required for decision (record all)				

Option: 58	Reduce Dumfries from a 3 Pump WT+WT+OC to a 3 Pump WT+DSDS/OC+OC station. AND Change WT duty system from 5WDS to 4WDS. AND Introduce Nucleus Crew Hub at Castle Douglas to improve local on-call pump availability and enhance the delivery of supporting activities.			SDA: West
Initial Status		Proceed to full hurdle criteria appraisal	☐	
Financial Sustainability?	Modernisation?	Discard from further consideration	☐	
		Further information required to make a decision	☐	
		Defer	☒	
Equalities cleared? (Y/N)				
Consensus Discussions (record key points only) This option should be considered due to its proximity to Gretna. This area would potentially benefit from the On Call Improvement programme. The run times need to be considered. Option 57 is BAU. A separate piece of work may be commissioned to look at the watch/ duty systems. Consideration to the 2nd Pump strategic placement to be given. 4WDS can help achieve savings. Further information required for decision (record all)				

Thank You

QSV

Insight | Change | Management