

**From:**  
**Sent:** 18 November 2016 17:34  
**To:** SHQ - Mattinson, Keith  
**Subject:** RDS pay review

Good evening Mr Mattinson,

I have been asked by my RDS unit to collate and send you our views/decisions regarding the RDS pay review.

Reasons to stay on a salary

Able to budget for monthly outgoings whilst on salary.

Even with banding drop, staff are still able to budget efficiently.

On salary, staff can book low value hours as flexi time rather than taking AL – maintains pump availability and staff flexibility.

On salary – flexi time awarded back for working public holidays.

Salary can be used as proof of earnings – i.e. mortgage applications etc.

Salary is better for staff moral and staff retention.

6 month review would be preferable to 12 month review as pay protection only comes in if incident numbers drop in comparison to previous year.

Why not to go on to Ts & As.

it was felt figures have been inflated on the pay breakdown.

Turnout values – does not take into account incidents where 6 persons on call/responded – does not take into consideration the 6<sup>th</sup> person not being paid.

If Ts & As come in – 5+1 was only traditionally on Bank Holidays to bring in line with minimum staffing.

As we are an outlying station, having a 6h person on the pump is invaluable due to the length of time it takes for the 2<sup>nd</sup> pump to arrive.

If the pump goes SIU and misses an incident, all staff on call will miss out on pay, not just the staff member who has dropped the pump to an SIU.

Having 6 staff on the crew gives development FF's the opportunity to gain experience when riding as number 6. Theoretically until a FF has completed their RDS BA course, they would not be able to ride the appliance.

In conclusion, the view of S58 is that we would vote to stay on a salary scheme.

Many thanks

S58 Tarleton

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** 21 November 2016 20:54  
**To:** SHQ - Mattinson, Keith;  
**Subject:** N18 RDS Salary Consultation Response

Keith,

Please find attached the RDS salary consultation response from the crew at Garstang.

In response to the above consultation the crew at Garstang would like to put forward the following observations for your consideration.

There is a strong consensus on station that they would like the salary system to remain the same. Any pay protection should be used to ensure staff that are dropping a banding do not lose any money.

We understand that the drive behind this pay review is to try and improve the service, retention/recruitment and increase appliance availability and not to necessarily put extra money in our pockets. We're of the belief that T's&A's will not do anything to address these issues.

The number of turn outs appears to have levelled off over the past few years. A re-banding exercise would more than likely reflect the future turn outs levels and reduce the risk of stations being dropped a banding in the future.

In this financial climate we feel you have not grasped the importance of the security for family finances that a set salary gives you. What we're being asked to do is gamble with our family finances.

As part of our initial response to the RDS salary working group we stressed the current burden on watch officers and with a narrow pay gap nobody on the unit is willing to progress because of the stress, hassle and responsibility associated with the role. The introduction of the T's&A's system will add a far bigger managerial

burden than you expect with managing an adequate rostering system along with managing expectations of the crew who are being forced to be rostered off and who are potentially losing money.

The unit appreciates the effort that the service put in to provide a financial break down of the impact of the new system. However, we feel these calculations are not accurate enough to form the basis of a pay protection scheme. The calculations credit you for historical T's&A's regardless of whether it came into the criteria of the 5 T's and 1 A or what station they were accrued at.

The system of pay protection reimburses staff in year 2 on a monthly basis for pay they have lost in year 1. This system is unfair and would tie staff down to completing the second year just to re-coup the money they're owed. Pay protection should be paid as a lump sum at the end of year 1 or at termination of contract.

N18 Garstang

Regards,

Lancashire Fire and Rescue Service  
Garstang Fire Station- N18

---

**From:**

**Sent:** 10 November 2016 12:28

**To:** SHQ - Mattinson, Keith

**Cc:**

**Subject:** RDS Pay Review Proposal

**Importance:** High

Hi Keith,

Following your advice, can I take this opportunity to send you some feedback from S56 Skelmersdale Retained Unit regarding the proposed new pay scheme. As a unit, we have discussed at great length the proposed hybrid model which you sent a copy of to all Retained staff members. Having had the time to digest all the information and having attended the information session at STC, we have arrived at the following decision.

We asked all staff members to vote on which scheme they thought was most suitable moving forward and the results were unanimous in favour of remaining on the existing salary scheme. Although we can all fully appreciate the difficulties in implementing a system which will suit all parties, we feel that there is too much uncertainty in the proposed scheme were staff will be reliant on turnouts to subsidise their pay. You mentioned in your briefing sessions that the aim is to introduce a long term solution to the pay structure but, having discussed this we feel that after the pay protection period finishes in 3 years' time, staff may find themselves considerably out of pocket and no longer able to budget for monthly outgoings. This was not viewed as a long term solution and many of our staff have said that it may force them to look for alternative employment.

We have looked at the proposal you have documented in your letter for the existing pay scheme which would take us from the 400 banding to the 300 banding and whilst this would result in a deduction of pay for all staff members, again it was a unanimous decision with staff being happier to reduce a banding and be guaranteed a monthly wage than the proposed fear of the unknown as the turnout figures continue to reduce year on year. We have also discussed the introduction of the proposed EFR pilot being introduced across the service but having looked at the existing figures for red 1 incidents across the county, we do not feel this would make a substantial difference to our current activity levels. With S56 Skelmersdale currently being a 2 pump DCP & RDS station, any red 1 incidents are likely to be attended by L56P1 and with current ongoing discussions to remove key station status, we will lose further turnouts by not being required for standby on station. Please feel free to contact me if you need any further information and a member of staff will be attending when you reconvene the working group to discuss the options moving forward.

Regards

Skelmersdale Fire Station

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** 17 November 2016 19:02  
**To:** SHQ - Mattinson, Keith  
**Cc:**  
**Subject:** RDS Pay Review

Hi Keith,

I only have 2 comments to make on the review as follows:

FAQ Point 26: The old system allowed for 6 Turnouts, and a further 2 Attendances in the event 8 personnel were on call. In practise it rarely happened that 8 were on call anyway. I think this should be readopted as it isn't fair that only 5 get a Turnout. In the event of a protracted incident which takes several hours, everyone on the machine should get paid.

My other comment is a general point relating to pensions. Please find attached my latest pension projection which makes pretty grim reading for me.

I would ask you consider anything which could assist RDS firefighters get a better deal, perhaps accelerated pension earnings, or anything else which would indirectly help with recruitment and retention of RDS Firefighters.

Regards

---

**From:** W34  
**Sent:** 18 November 2016 15:35  
**To:** SHQ - Mattinson, Keith  
**Subject:** RDS Pay

At STC on 20th October you said the current salary model was based on 7 on call at all times, that was the 'ideal' however as you are aware this very rarely happens. We feel very strongly that only paying for 5 turnouts and 1 attendance is not acceptable and will cause issues such as; less personnel on call increasing the chance of an appliance failure to mobilise, less flexibility amongst staff and increased chance of personnel missing a turnout. Simply- maximise the seats on the appliance; 6 seats, 6 people get paid a turnout, and 1 person gets paid an attendance. Not only is this then the safest and potentially the quickest way to deal with an incident but with a lack of turnouts (on the whole) more chance for people to gain vital experience. As you know not all incidents will attract a response of 7 personnel, some will have as little as 3 so you will not be paying for 7 every time. The proposal for 5 T's and 1 A is financially limiting how many personnel ride an appliance, this does not happen in the wholetime and it should not happen in the RDS. The Service want to reward commitment, so reward the commitment of those on call and those stations who manage to the 'ideal' of 7 on call.

---

**From:** W34  
**Sent:** 18 November 2016 18:28  
**To:** SHQ - Mattinson, Keith  
**Subject:** RDS payroll

As a unit we agree the hybrid model is the fairest scheme however there is one major point we do not agree with and would like to raise...

At STC on 20th October you said the current salary model was based on 7 on call at all times, that was the 'ideal' however as you are aware this very rarely happens. We feel very strongly that only paying for 5 turnouts and 1 attendance is not acceptable and will cause issues such as; less personnel on call increasing the chance of an appliance failure to mobilise, less flexibility amongst staff and increased chance of personnel missing a turnout. Simply- maximise the seats on the appliance; 6 seats, 6 people get paid a turnout, and 1 person gets paid an attendance. Not only is this then the safest and potentially the quickest way to deal with an incident but with a lack of turnouts (on the whole) more chance for people to gain vital experience. As you know not all incidents will attract a response of 7 personnel, some will have as little as 3 so you will not be paying for 7 every time. The proposal for 5 T's and 1 A is financially limiting how many personnel ride an appliance, this does not happen in the wholetime and it should not happen in the RDS. The Service want to reward commitment, so reward the commitment of those on call and those stations who manage to the 'ideal' of 7 on call.

---

**From:**

**Sent:** 19 November 2016 16:36

**To:** SHQ - Mattinson, Keith

**Cc:**

**Subject:** RDS Pay Review

Hi Keith,

Following discussions with the unit as a whole we would like to raise the following points, we would also like to apologise in advance if we have raised issues which are a result of misunderstanding the proposal.

- **Annual Leave Payments**

- Currently many unit members do not take their full entitlement of leave to maintain pump availability; this is done through good will and desire to maintain N13's availability and to protect Bolton-le-Sands and the wider community.
- Our concerns are that by having a cash incentive to take leave, unit members will be incentivised to take their full entitlement. Accordingly, this will counteract the current process which works well; thus pump availability is likely to be reduced.
- N13 would be satisfied to see the annual leave payments incorporated into the annual salary, rather than reward time off the run.

- **Recruitment**

- The majority of N13's staff have previously been paid on the T and A system. At the time of being paid Ts and As, many members had difficulty in annual budgeting, furthermore, mortgage lenders would not consider unknown salaries when deciding on loan amounts and mortgage approvals.
- This is causing a problem for N13, especially for 2 new recruits who are currently renting and looking to buy. Remaining on a salaried scheme will be more beneficial for those units wishing to recruit a cohort who are looking for a definite and calculable income.

- **Number of Riders**

- The introduction of payment for 5 riders and one attendance may pose an issue to the development, knowledge and practical skills for FFs in development. The proposal, although allows for a rider above the minimum requirement, it does not give OICs the flexibility to load the appliance with sufficiently experienced FFs for complex jobs whilst giving opportunities for FFs in development exposure and quality on-the-job training.
- Offering 6 turn-out payments (with the option of an attendance for number 6 if the pump departs with 5 riders) gives the OICs more flexibility in balancing response times and development of skills.
- Taking into consideration point 23 (FAQs) this additional payment to a 6<sup>th</sup> rider is negligible given that the majority of turn-outs have under 6 riders. However, offering the additional payment gives units more opportunity to practice and develop essential skills.

- **Maintenance of Good Morale and FF Retention**

- Stand by at N11 - Local arrangements currently have N15 as 1<sup>st</sup> choice for Stand by N11 – Lancaster. Will the opportunity for this be shared between neighbouring stations, bearing in mind that the projected earnings figure produced was at a time when N13 was being mobilised to stand by? I understand that this is an area arrangement however staff at N13 wish for this to be raised.
- Rostering / Flexibility  
We appreciate this is more of a unit management issue; however at N13 we have self-employed unit members who provide impeccable day cover who rely on full contract flexibility.

Our concern is that to impose rostering (eg rostering them off at night) may impact on the flexible day cover they provide. We are also concerned that if we suggest a change of contracted hours to these individuals and remove flexibility they may leave the service.

- Making up for under establishment / goodwill  
(N13 currently 272 Hours under establishment)

We acknowledge that the turnout payment will reward individuals who provide cover above their contract to repair breaches, but only if they are turned out. There is no reward or incentive other than to wish to be mobilised. With this in mind if a unit is under establishment could a further reward be considered as the current time owing system is extremely difficult to manage and often individuals do not have the opportunity to take it. This point would be more relevant on quieter RDS units.

- **Banding and Pay Protection**

- N13 are currently on the 200 banding, the recent pay projection indicated we would drop to a 100. Validity of this point has been questioned as we have been busier over the last 2 years. As such, N13 staff members are seeking reassurance that total salary under the proposed system does not fall below that which is currently being paid.

01/04/2015 to 31/03/2016 - 140 incidents

01/04/2016 to date - 82 incidents (no stand by N11 included)

Many thanks  
All at N13.

---

**From:**

**Sent:** 20 November 2016 13:04

**To:** SHQ - Mattinson, Keith

**Subject:** RE: RDS PAY REVIEW

Keith, the ACO has encouraged a response from all RDS units and I would therefore like to put the following forward as part of the consultation.

Pay difference between RDS FF, CM and WM. Pay differentials maybe in line with Grey book whole time staff but there are massive differences between ad WM wholetime and WM RDS who is more than just a WM because he manages the unit. A WM wholetime is a WM when at work a WM RDS is never off duty unless on annual leave. We have to respond to problems 24 hours a day. We don't just manage the staff within the unit but we manage the building as well. Therefore, I don't think you can compare a WM wholetime and WM RDS as being the same with regards to pay differentials in line with grey book. Until there are greater financial differences between the ranks we will find it increasingly difficult to persuade RDS FFs to develop into crew managers and unit managers. Due to the pay review more and more responsibility will be placed onto Unit Managers with regards to devising a system of rostering, staff contacting unit managers at all times of the day and night and never being off call even when not on call.

Also, with regards to 5 turnouts and 1 attendance. In the past you have always paid 6 turnouts on a Bank holiday. There is also no scope for Failure to Report with the potential of not being able to turn out and therefore putting the public of Lancashire at risk.

Regards  
N14 Carnforth

---

From:]  
Sent: 20 November 2016 14:17  
To: SHQ - Mattinson, Keith  
Subject: Re:new rds pay structure feedback

To whom it may concern,

I am writing to offer my feedback on the new pay structure and raise some concerns that I have with it and was told this was the email address to send it to.

My main concern is that with the new structure the more hours a person is contracted to the more they are reliant on activity levels in order to get a wage that is the same/better than what the current salary offers e.g my wages on the new structure without any activities other than drills and retaining fee is about £1000 a year short of my current salary therefore I am relying on call outs to take my wage to where it is now and with current staffing levels at my station and no doubt numerous stations across the service being lower than they should be,there are times when the pump is off/siu when I am available and on call.

If I am available and on call but the pump is not and there is a call in my station area that my pump would of gone on if available then why should I as a firefighter who is on call and available be financially punished for something that is effectively out of my control.

As a father of two young children I cannot be relying on a wage that is fluctuating from one month to the next dependant on whether my pump is available and its feels like very much a kick in the teeth to the people who are available and doing there contracted hours to be punished because the station is low on staff.

My next point is that as I said before the more hours a person is contracted to the more they are reliant on activity and this to me seems absolutely no incentive to cover more hours at your station,most retained stations are likely to be undermanned in some capacity so surely an incentive to contract yourself to more hours regardless of activity levels should be there to intice more staff to increase there hours which will in turn increase the availability of appliances around the service.

Aswell as this if the financial rewards were better for doing more Hours you would find that it would become a more appealing job for people to apply for and also increase retention of staff which I know is a struggle at our station so again is probably a service wide issue.

I hope this feedback can possibly bring about some minor changes that could make this new pay structure work for everyone.

Regards

P75 Haslingden

---

From  
Sent: 20 November 2016 20:00  
To: SHQ - Mattinson, Keith  
Subject: RDS pay

1. Why change the current system as i feel it works well and is fair.
2. My salary has been calculated on where i was first employed. The station was closed and most of the retained staff were moved to the new station at STC ON 1/10/15. the effect of this move mean i am now taking 9mins + to turn in and i feel i will be penalised for living on the far edge of the turn in area. Only Paying the first 5 a turn out will will have an impact on safety as staff will exceed the speed limit to make sure they turn out, we should all be paid the same regardless of whether we are first or last in. peoples salary losses will make them leave the service as no one will work for less money. my salary will be cut once the calculations for the new station are used. We are in a unique situation at chorley due to us moving station locations. could anything be done to ensure the RDS staff at S54 do not loose money as the situation is out of our hands. this situation will effect some staff more than the others due to living the furthest

Thank you

---

From:  
Sent: 20 November 2016 21:21  
To: SHQ - Mattinson, Keith  
Cc:  
Subject: FW: Pay

Please refer to the Items below.

With reference to the pay FAQ's

Item 8 Pay protection, if you qualify for pay protection one month, and the following month you earn more due to activity, Will that protection from the previous month be taken back?

Item 11 Holidays, I still can't get my head round why everyone cant be allocated a certain number of holiday hours per year and just take what they need if crewing levels permit. Similar to how T/O is booked. This would be helpful when individuals are willing to help cover the pump for a few hours here and there if they aren't going away or are using up A/L.

Item 13 Time Owing, Not getting any T/O for Public Holidays and hoping activity will keep the pump available isn't realistic. I feel dropping T/O will create massive problems for Unit Managers.

Item 14 Sickness, 4 drill night payments!!!, If your off sick for longer than four weeks why do you lose your drill payments? This has not been the case during the salary scheme, and like Time Owing has been custom and practise for many years now, Why are we taking a backward step?

Item 26 5 Riders, This to me seems like a sprat to catch a mackerel, whilst everyone argues about this issue, because there are a host of obvious reasons to all of the RDS Managers why it would be more beneficial to pay 6 turnouts. Its probably the one issue that may be changed whilst the bigger issues slip through.

General.

Will any percentage pay increases be added to the Pay protection figures or are we telling the potential losers on this new Pay structure that they are not only getting a pay freeze for the next few years but ultimately a pay drop.

We talk about Retention and recruitment, so we need to get this right as most of the basic Firefighters wages are quite poor. I'm not sure that we are confident to base the new scheme on assumptions of activity, is the way forward ?

Kind regards  
Fleetwood RDS Unit.

---

**From:** P73 –  
**Sent:** 21 November 2016 09:24  
**To:** SHQ - Mattinson, Keith  
**Subject:** RDS salary review

Good morning Keith.

I just wanted to send in the response from P93 Barnoldswick regarding the proposed RDS Hybrid Salary. Overall the staff believe that it is a much improved and fairer scheme, there has been discussion at length regarding the 5 turnouts plus 1 attendance however we believe it will incentivise the staff to turn out as quickly as possible when they are available and provide a little of the much needed motivation in two areas we have been trying to improve on over the past few years. I have discussed the impacts of going to 6 turn outs and the financial impact that could have on the retaining fee part of the salary and the overall opinion is that 5 plus 1 can work particularly with the ridership vision of the service being 5 as a maximum.

There were no other issues raised from our unit.

Regards

---

**From:** E70 -  
**Sent:** 21 November 2016 09:46  
**To:** SHQ - Mattinson, Keith  
**Subject:** RE: RDS Salary Review Summary Consultation Responses

Hi Keith

Thanks for sending this out prior to the next meeting I have had a quick read through but really need to sit down and read all the comments more thoroughly before we meet again.

I have had many a conversation regarding the pay and it would seem that the 5 rider crew was a major point to all I have spoken to I have also been in talks with retained units regarding standby's and I think this is also a major point that most are missing, when NWFC started I tried to talk with most stations regarding standby's and the potential for RDS appliances not to be used for standby this fell mostly on deaf ears as RDS units thought that the amount of standby they got would not impact on the banding, I would now like to raise this again a say that if we do go to the Grey Book Plus type of pay then this could cause a lot of problems as then a shout is a shout and not a banding off 100 and every standby will count, If the current process of sending a whole time pump standby before a RDS appliance stays then this would reduce the chance of RDs appliances going to larger incidents as the whole time appliances close in to the incident it would leave RDS appliance at home satiation unaware of the incident or standbys thus reducing pay. Also if they take away key stations then this would reduce our pay at Hyndburn dramatically.

As a unit at Hyndburn we wasn't in any way looking to change the current pay system saying this though we can understand that other stations are losing out so from Hyndburn's RDS unit as long as we can sort out the 5 riders to 6 and 1 attendance and the services reverts back to the nearest pumps goes standby then we will support the change.

Thanks  
E70 RDS Unit

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** 21 November 2016 11:25  
**To:** SHQ - Mattinson, Keith  
**Subject:** RDS Salary return

Hi Keith

Having read through the FAQs and powerpoint presentation again, please find my bit to add to the consultation.

Overall I am in favour of a scheme that rewards hours of cover and the £6250 for **all** FF covering 120 hours is a great improvement from the currently salary. With the added incentive for extra payment for attending incidents the busiest RDS stations should be able to plug gaps in availability in the short/medium time.

**FAQ 26** Rostering – Could we not allow all 6 personnel to ride the appliance and be paid a Turnout, or all 12 ride and be paid a Turnout at a 2 pump station?

This has been a recurring theme at the briefings and we have suggested that personnel respond to the consultation accordingly, highlighting the benefits of any proposed amendments.

My consolation response

In response to a maximum of 6 people receiving payment when responding to their alerter and this then broken down to 5 being paid a turnout fee and the last person responding being paid an attendance fee. If this element is introduced it will cause conflict at a time when the OIC of the appliance needs to be focusing on attending the incident.

I suggest that we have a maximum of 6 people responding and these 6 people receive a turnout fee **if they** turn out to an incident.

This should not affect costing greatly as FQA 23 states that only 20% of turnouts had 6 riders

**FQA 22** There is no recognition for the responsibility of the W/M of the unit...

Payments for additional hours recognise this element and we pay these at the appropriate grey book hourly rate.



My consolation response

As we are recognising that these additional hours are part of the Watch Managers responsibility in running the unit, should we also be including these additional hours of payment (as above) within the pension scheme.

**FQA 30** Booking back on cover – there is no financial reward for booking back on cover if there are no incidents..

The converse of this is the financial reward for booking back on cover if there are several incidents.

My consolation response

I feel there will be less pressure on Watch Mangers to encourage crew members to book extra hours on call outside of their contract, as individuals will make their own mind up if they want to plug any gaps and take the risk in not getting any turnouts.

**Chorley**

---

From:

Sent: 21 November 2016 14:18

To: SHQ - Mattinson, Keith

Subject: Rds pay review

Hello Keith

With ref to turnouts and attendance's on the new proposals it states 5 will get a T and after that an A, we have quite often 6 on the pump who arrive more or less together, i will take 6 on the pump in that scenario so can all 6 book a T.

Secondly since we moved station at least 2 of the crew have gone from living 300 meters away to over 2 miles away and this means through no fault of there own they regularly get left which will put them in a poor position going forward.

I am in favour of the proposals in general.

---

**From:** P92 -

**Sent:** 21 November 2016 19:33

**To:** SHQ - Mattinson, Keith

**Subject:** RE: RDS PAY REVIEW

Hi Keith,

Having spoken with the personnel at Padiham, all are in favour of the pay review. The only concern that the majority could not agree with is the 6<sup>th</sup> person only getting an attendance. We felt that this could cause some conflict if numbers 5 & 6 arrived at the same time and also the number of occasions that there are 6 available is few and far between. Apart from that it's a big yes from Padiham and we would collectively like thank you and your group for all the hard work that has been put into this review

---

**From:**

**Sent:** 21 November 2016 21:58

**To:** SHQ - Mattinson, Keith

**Subject:** RDS pay review consultation feedback

Keith,

Can I start by saying I appreciate that one proposal will not suit all and that I also know the amount of thought and work gone in to get us to this point.

I agree that the drill nights should be paid separately allowing for the WT to provide a dual contract and again I accept that the T and A approach would allow for flexible dual contracts without having one individual paid considerably more than the next although I don't agree that individuals should be worse off for providing the same role whilst as a service we are expecting more and more from all levels of staff.

The T and A approach could be considered an incentive to the WT undertaking the Dual Contract role however for many individuals the uncertainty of income will still be a barrier. Consideration could be given to allowing WT personnel to accrue the equivalent number of TO for the time given i.e. 6 hours cover equals one hour time owing if they are not mobilised to an incident. Thought must be given to staff accruing TO from one

station to be used at another which could impact on the work output and training on WT stations, this would however ensure that the individual; regardless of incident activity is recompensed for their time and if they are mobilised to an incident then the financial recompense replaces the TO.

Having worked the RDS and managed the units in Southern a considerable amount of work is completed by the unit managers which is 'good will' along with a large restriction on individuals lives, being fixed to their response areas. If I consider my time managing the Wholetime as either a CM, WM or SM there is very little good will (if not no good will with some units) they are always recompensed for their time be this Time Owing or Overtime and should we propose to change these conditions it would be meet with considerable resistance from the staff themselves and the Union; whereas within the RDS it is an accepted practise which mainly goes un-thanked. I, more than most understand, that not all units are run correctly nor do they all put the required time and dedication in to their work as well as knowing not all staff are doing the role for the financial gain , I didn't; but when I consider the time given and the impact on my personal life I am concerned how we will attract the correct attributes in people when we potentially reduce pay for some. I understand the pot has stayed the same and then re invested in the retaining fee at each re-banding however as a service we rely heavily on the RDS units to maintain our response standards and considering the staff profile Lancashire could be considered an RDS service with WT resources rather than WT with some RDS. At present the 3 year pay cap will provide some stability although on discussion with unit members their longer term plan is to see how the scheme effects their pay and potentially leave the service after the 3 years. It would be an interesting exercise to project pay from 2010 – 2016 (based upon the current figures) and see how their wages would have been effected. Considering this and our activity levels, their concern is that looking forward (post 3 years) their current 'better off/worse off' position may result in every one being far worse off; I appreciate this may go the other way however as a service our aim is to reduce incidents. I would hazard a guess that had we remained on T's and A's rather than salary, RDS pay would be far less than at present. On this topic is it an incentive to RDS units to partake in education, engagement and incident reduction activities given that in this reduction concurrently reduces their personal income. Could consideration be given to a change to the salary scheme which would see the re-banding effectively frozen (unless there is significant cause too) and then a T and A approach for additional hours covered when an individual books back available and attends an incident. This would need to be managed locally to ensure that individuals only come back on to maintain minimum crewing whilst incentivising good will. I accept that this could be abused by staff reducing contracted hours and then booking back available to gain extra income however WM/SDMs would need to manage this locally and address any concerns; additionally this approach would also assist with Dual Contract staff.

The topic of rostering is discussed a lot at present and I am aware it is not new; my thoughts on this may or may not be seen by others. Across the service 4 riders is now the norm regardless of skillset or specialty and as a responding FDO this is considered when attending incidents due to decreased resources in the initial stages. Given that 80% of the time 5 or fewer riders are available for a one pump RDS station I feel it would be more prudent to enable the other 20% to attend incidents with 6 staff, if 6 respond. Not only does this provide the incident with more personnel it also enables WM/CM to upskill all Firefighters at Operational Incidents. The current turnover of staff and incident numbers means that some RDS units have very inexperienced Firefighters and Managers; by providing this option it would enable some up skilling. Given that of recent we have waited hours for an Ambulance attendance (if one has arrived at all) I have welcomed the RDS's commitment to ride at 6; plus given the pay difference between turning out and attending, if they are used at the incident it will have paid dividends.

I accept that RDS members are considering their options at present and as a service a large amount of work has gone into providing a proposal; I am also acutely aware that potentially I haven't provided another option although I have considered a lot given to me and accept that there may not be a perfect solution; I would like to see LFRS become more RDS centred and provide more incentives to enable recruitment and retention.

Thanks

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** 17 November 2016 11:57  
**To:** SHQ - Mattinson, Keith  
**Cc:**  
**Subject:** RDS Salary Review

Morning Keith,

Thanks again for allowing me to opportunity to discuss some concerns about the proposals. To summarise I have listed the outcomes below:

I am generally supportive of the move from bandings to an adaption of Grey Book conditions - T&A's approach

We would like to see the number of personnel available to turn out be increased to 6 for a number of reasons:

- To allow maximum exposure to the accepted decreasing number of incidents especially by those in development that may be left behind if only 5 turn outs are paid. Or potentially having someone turn out in the 6<sup>th</sup> seat who is not being paid (fairness & insurance considerations for this).
- As an officer in charge, having 6 personnel available to me in the early stages of an incident has obvious benefits, and whilst the pump can turn out with 4 riders, having 6 could impact on tactics, resolving incidents sooner and safer.

Attendances should be limited to the number of people that should be contracted to that point in time (ie 7 personnel). Thereby allowing for 6 turn outs and 1 attendance.

The proposed offer of pay whilst sick does not, in my opinion, afford a level of financial security which the current salary does. This is due to being paid the flat retainer whilst on sick leave. If this period of sick was to be for an extended period of time, the monthly salary (at E70) would roughly be half of what it is currently, adding to pressures and stresses of being off sick anyway. Please consider putting some safeguard into the salary along a similar line to annual leave.

Please add into FAQ's, where it explains that sickness is at grey book terms and conditions it goes onto say about 'unless it's a service injury' but it doesn't clarify what the position would be in that case.

Regards,

---

**From:** N15  
**Sent:** 16 November 2016 18:56  
**To:** SHQ - Mattinson, Keith  
**Subject:** RDS pay review

Thank you for the FAQ email the crew at N15 have discussed locally and at this stage from what I can gather a large majority are in favour of the new proposals. The Rostering 5 plus 1 is still an issue. Presuming the proposals will go to a vote in the new year, will everybody get their say or will it be Rep body members only

---

**From:** E91 –  
**Sent:** 16 November 2016 18:23  
**To:** SHQ - Mattinson, Keith  
**Cc:**  
**Subject:** RE: RDS SALARY - OCTOBER BRIEFINGS 2016

Hi Keith,

Thanks for your reply. I would just like to clarify the highlighted point below, my concern was not 12 or more firefighters responding to a 2 pump incident but the same number responding to what turns out to be a 1 pump incident. If I understood your letter correctly this would mean, out of the 12, 5 would be paid a turnout fee, 1 would be paid an attendance and 6 would not receive anything. This is what I felt was misleading and not represented in your figures.

Could you please let me know, of the incidents attended by Clitheroe over the 17 month period, how many were 2 pump incidents and how many were 1 pump incidents.

I think this information could provide a clearer understanding of potential earnings for some firefighters on our station.

I am also still struggling to see how recruitment and retention will be positively affected by this scheme?

Thanks  
E91  
Clitheroe

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** 16 November 2016 17:29  
**To:** SHQ - Mattinson, Keith  
**Cc:**  
**Subject:** RDS Pay- W35 Lytham Response

Hi Keith,

Please find below a joint response from W35 Lytham on the proposed changes to the RDS Salary scheme;

As a unit we agree the hybrid model is the fairest scheme however there is one major point we do not agree with and would like to raise...

At STC on 20<sup>th</sup> October you said the current salary model was based on 7 on call at all times, that was the 'ideal' however as you are aware this very rarely happens. We feel very strongly that only paying for 5 turnouts and 1 attendance is not acceptable and will cause issues such as; less personnel on call increasing the chance of an appliance failure to mobilise, less flexibility amongst staff and increased chance of personnel missing a turnout. Simply- maximise the seats on the appliance; 6 seats, 6 people get paid a turnout, and 1 person gets paid an attendance. Not only is this then the safest and potentially the quickest way to deal with an incident but with a lack of turnouts (on the whole) more chance for people to gain vital experience. As you know not all incidents will attract a response of 7 personnel, some will have as little as 3 so you will not be paying for 7 every time. The proposal for 5 T's and 1 A is financially limiting how many personnel ride an appliance, this does not happen in the wholetime and it should not happen in the RDS. The Service want to reward commitment, so reward the commitment of those on call and those stations who manage to the 'ideal' of 7 on call.

Many thanks,

---

**From:** E72 -  
**Sent:** 15 November 2016 18:47  
**To:** SHQ - Mattinson, Keith  
**Subject:** RDS PAY

Hi Keith,

I think the general feeling at our station is that the new proposed scheme would be better for us here at E72  
Kind Regards.

---

**From:** P96 -  
**Sent:** 15 November 2016 15:24  
**To:** SHQ - Mattinson, Keith  
**Subject:** RDS proposed pay scheme

Hi Keith

I have a few concerns regarding the proposed changes to the RDS pay scheme.

- Only paying 5 turnouts and 1 attendance. I believe that this should be 6 turnouts
- Although I can see some improvements for certain individuals and I can appreciate that it is better than the original turnouts and attendances scheme, I feel that the proposed scheme rewards people that live closer to the fire station and punishes those that live further away.
- I also think that the new scheme encourages people to speed into station. I know LFRS view is individuals shouldn't break the speed limit, however you know as well as I do that under the new scheme this will happen.
- How much of the new scheme is pensionable?
- There is no incentive for staff to become managers. This is somewhat of a 2 pump anomaly. By which I mean, more often than not when the alerter sounds there is only 1 appliance out of the 2 that we have at Colne being mobilised. The first 5 in would get the turnout leaving the remaining 7 to sign for an attendance. Normally I am the 5<sup>th</sup> man on station from my home address but as I am a Crew manager I have to wait for the second appliance as the other manager lives closer. This means that I would be better off as a fire fighter earning a turnout than an officer getting an attendance. This applies to others that were looking at acting up but are now reconsidering promotion.
- Could there not be a standard payment for the first hour of an incident whether or not you turnout or attend. Perhaps drop the disturbance payment and pay an hour for both. On a 2 pump station this would ease the pain of not catching 1 pump incidents and reduce friction between personnel on station.

Thanks for your attention  
P96 Colne

---

**From:** P73 -  
**Sent:** 15 November 2016 12:11  
**To:** SHQ - Mattinson, Keith; SHQ - Russel, David  
**Cc:**  
**Subject:** RDS Pay review

Hi All –

With regards to RDS pay review, after a unit discussion we are all in favour of the new hybrid model with the only question of current proposed riding levels. We are all in agreement that it should be 6 turnouts and possibly do away with 1 attendance. Reasons being that RDS joined to being committed to wanting to actually turnout not just to station. The current situation at present in low levels of activity as impacted on low morale, feeling dejected, lack of experience on incidents to name a few. So to potentially implement rostering for 5 T/outs takes people out of the job which they joined to do. One issue we need to acknowledge is RDS personnel give a lot of commitment to the service which is thankfully being slowly accepted but whilst any member is on call they expect to turn out and not just be turned away from riding an appliance with space or attending an incident for recompense as an attendance.

---

From: S53 -  
Sent: 15 November 2016 10:12  
To: SHQ - Mattinson, Keith  
Cc:  
Subject: RDS pay review - issues.

Good morning Keith,

Having attended one of the RDS pay scheme review meetings held at STC I wish to thank you, on behalf of myself and other RDS personnel at S53 Bamber bridge.

From the meeting it was clear that the pay review group and yourself have worked hard to come up with a best fit solution for all. Given the RDS system has so many iterations and local agreements we feel that on the whole the scheme recommendations you have made are fair and should offer some additional incentive to staff members to provide additional commitment if necessary.

There are however a few things that we would like to put forward to further improve the scheme :

5 turn outs and 1 attendance - Whilst we appreciate you have based this on the grey book rules, We as a station often ride 6 crew members or more (especially during the evening periods) with this in mind we feel that the service should consider changing the scheme to 6 turn outs and 1 attendance. This will provide additional personnel power at incidents but will also mean that if for some reason, rostering has occurred but staff members still turnout due to there being an overlap in time. (e.g. someone is rostered off from 18:00, alerter goes off at 17:59 and the next crew member responds as they believe it was 18:00 when the alerter goes off in addition to the crew member due to clock off at 18:00) in this case both people have been disturbed but based on the proposed scheme 1 staff member would lose out and not get paid through no fault of their own.

The removal of time owing for hours covered of public holidays – We realise the service is proposing an extra financial incentive to provide cover on a public holiday, the scheme will only provide that reward if the individual is actually required to turnout and or attend an incident. Time owing gives that reward to the individual regardless of them turning out or not meaning that there is a guaranteed reward for covering X amount of hours on that given day.

RDS units going on standby at certain stations – Currently we are aware of RDS stations who have made an agreement with NWFC to be sent standby to certain stations in order to increase the pumps chances of attending an incident and as a result gain additional operational experience (Something we are in the process of trying to arrange for ourselves). Will this be stopped under the new proposals as the service will incur additional expense?

On a side note to the above, we hosted a feedback meeting of our own for RDS staff on our station a few months ago to ascertain any issues that we could look to take action upon in order to improve our unit as a whole. One of the issue was lack of activity hence us trying to make this agreement with NWFC. The new scheme proposal does put a financial incentive in place to help make the commitment of being an RDS staff member worthwhile, however for the vast majority of staff, being an RDS member is about attending the incidents and being able to help other members of the community or Lancashire as a whole and not just about the wages each month. If the service was to start utilising RDS personnel less and less due to the additional finances involved then there is a potential that staff turnover / retention will take a downward turn again due to reduced activity levels and the scheme will have potentially helped to contribute towards the changes in turnover / retention.

An interesting idea has been put forward by one of our other ACM's, he has suggested the possibility of a tiered pay scheme based around skill sets. So additional payment for being a driver or for acting up. The longer someone spends in the RDS they generally achieve these skills and become more and more vital to the pump. It is rare that the pump goes off the run for a firefighter or BA alone, generally it is due to their being no driver or OIC being available. At Bamber Bridge we generally all rally around to get the pump covered where ever possible, often resulting in an OIC or driver having to give up his/her "off call" time in order to bring the pump back on. This causes that person to go over his/her contracted hours out of the goodness of their heart (the proposed scheme will provide some form of financial incentive – which is not guaranteed based on there being a turnout or not). If something was implemented along those lines there would be incentive for people to take on those additional responsibilities and the individual would feel appreciated by the service too. The wholtime watches are entitled to CPD payment which covers those skills, at present out of 16 staff members

there is only our WM entitled to the retained equivalent as every time someone acts up the clock resets itself and the 5 years restarts over again.

Once again, as a unit we do believe the proposed scheme is certainly a step forward but there are some issues that we feel need to be addressed.

Kind regards,

RDS watch at S53 Bamber Bridge

---

**From:** W36 -  
**Sent:** 14 November 2016 20:05  
**To:** SHQ - Mattinson, Keith  
**Cc:**  
**Subject:** Proposed pay system

Keith,

The officers of our retained unit at St. Annes have spoken at length to the members of our unit about the proposed hybrid pay system of enhanced retaining fee plus turnouts and attendances.

The overwhelming response we received was that whilst they were reasonably happy with the new system they felt that there should be six turnouts paid plus at least one attendance paid per incident. Some of the older members, who were in when T's & A's were being paid previously, stated that everyone who turned in for a firecall used to be paid either a turnout or attendance.

Rostering was only used on bank holidays, and was done to keep us in line with wholetime firefighters as we were all paid double time. It was muted that it was going to be applied all of the time but the salary scheme came in so it was never implemented.

As most of our salary cost will be an enhanced retaining fee we do not believe that doing this would have a massive financial effect on the budget, and would allow us to be more flexible.

Regards

---

**From:** P94  
**Sent:** 13 November 2016 15:21  
**To:** SHQ - Mattinson, Keith  
**Subject:** RE: RDS SALARY - OCTOBER BRIEFINGS 2016

Keith

May I take this opportunity to acknowledge and applaud your work in regard to the ongoing RDS salary issues. You were never going to please everybody but having read the various documents you've produced I believe the majority will accept that the proposed hybrid model will be a fairer and more rewarding system. However I've highlighted the following point for you to take to the working group for consultation;

- I believe the proposal of 5 and 1 for payment should be increased to 6 and 1 under the Rostering system. Some units now work on the basis of you can't roster off unless there are at least 7 personnel available. This alleviates issues in the event of FTRs or faulty alerters. Due to wholetime riding minimum more of the time it is good to know that there would be the potential of 6 Retained members attending as a PDA rather than 5.

Kind Regards  
P74 RDS

---

**From:** N12  
**Sent:** 12 November 2016 14:34  
**To:** SHQ - Mattinson, Keith  
**Cc:**  
**Subject:** RE: RDS SALARY - OCTOBER BRIEFINGS 2016  
**Importance:** High

Hi Keith

Thanks for the input, can I just suggest that 6 are paid for turnouts and 1 for attendance, this would give us resilience if one or more of the crew fail to respond for whatever reason and it would make it easier for rostering, as it has been highlighted that only occasionally there are more than 7 riders on the Gartan it shouldn't be much of a problem if 6 are paid for turn outs and 1 attendance.

Regards

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** 11 November 2016 18:15  
**To:** SHQ - Mattinson, Keith  
**Cc:**  
**Subject:** RDS Pay review response from E59 Longridge .

Hi Keith, I am pleased to inform you that the overall response from Longridge RDS unit concerning the current pay review is unanimously in favour of it . All of the crew were positive about the proposals and I personally heard several crew members state they would put themselves back on call if they had nothing pre-arranged to do, because at least now they would be getting a call out fee . The only concern is not being able to ride with a crew of 6 ( which at the moment is rarely anyway ) in most cases the 6th person who would have to get off the pump to sign an A would be the least qualified such as a probationary FF or non BA wearer, who would then be missing out on gaining valuable experience . Anyway Keith I hope this feedback is useful to you and as stated above the general feelings about the proposals are really good .

---

**From:** E76 -  
**Sent:** 09 November 2016 18:43  
**To:** SHQ - Mattinson, Keith  
**Subject:** Hybrid T and A Proposals.

Hi Keith,

Hope this email finds you well..

If I may respond to the proposals for the RDS Hybrid salary scheme, please accept this as my feedback.

Having referenced the proposals, both as an RDS unit collectively and on my own I feel there could be some sticking points outlined for the proposed scheme.

A couple of concerns, ref only paying for 5 Turnouts and 1 Attendance..

1 - A development Ff who is a non BA wearer; this could have a significant impact on whether the individual can crew the appliance and possibly have a knock on effect in the retention of new Firefighters working the RDS.

2 - This could also encourage RDS staff when responding to the station to risk driving their vehicles faster in an attempt to make it onto the appliance.

All in all I feel the hybrid system is a winner moving forward for the service.

Best regards

Retained Duty System



E76  
Darwen Fire Station

---

**From:** E76 -  
**Sent:** 07 November 2016 20:35  
**To:** SHQ - Mattinson, Keith  
**Subject:** PAY REVIEW

Although I agree in theory with the pay review changes, I strongly disagree with the proposal for the sixth person to be paid an attendance only. If a firefighter is riding as the sixth person he should be recompensed the same as the rest of the crew, a call out is a call out, a disturbed nights sleep is the same for everybody.

---

**From:** E76 -  
**Sent:** 07 November 2016 20:26  
**To:** SHQ - Mattinson, Keith  
**Subject:** RDS pay review

Evening Keith,

In response to the RDS pay review,

Although I am happy with the majority of the proposals, I strongly disagree with only paying the 5 turnouts and the 1 attendance, I believe the decision should be made to pay all 6 turnouts, reasons being : Safety of crews responding, firefighter riding who's in development, riding 6 for resources.

Kind Regards,  
E76

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** 07 November 2016 20:21  
**To:** SHQ - Mattinson, Keith  
**Subject:** RDS pay review feedback

Mr Mattinson,

In response to the RDS pay review. I strongly disagree with only paying out for 5 turnout and 1 attendance.

Regards

E76

---

**From:** E76 –  
**Sent:** 07 November 2016 18:21  
**To:** SHQ - Mattinson, Keith  
**Subject:** Rds pay scheme

Good morning Keith I wright in response to your correspondence to the proposed change in the RDS pay structure. I think it will be a lot better than the current structure. I believe it will encourage recruitment and retention of fire fighters in the service. My one concern is the you have said that only the first 5 will receive a turnout and the the sixth will receive an attendance. I think this is wrong and unfair. If your live further away from the station than others you probably will be last in every time. It will be demoralising and perhaps have a negative affect on that person. Why be on call if your not getting on the machine and attending incidents.

---

**From:** E76 -  
**Sent:** 07 November 2016 13:17  
**To:** SHQ - Mattinson, Keith  
**Subject:** Salary Review

Hi Keith

What's good.

1. Hours of commitment is now recognised in a fairer way than previous
2. Drills being excluded from pay will a) make everybody more keen to complete all drills b) remove one of the barriers for duel contract.
3. Additional reward for turnouts/attendances (which would be clear to see especially for newer RDS staff)
4. Protection for individuals who will be worse off under the new proposals.

What's bad

1. The payment of 5 T's and 1 A per incident; this will result in a number of issues for OIC's a) who do you inform not being paid a T? b) Invariably this will be a development FF who needs the experience. c) It will always be the same people, furthest away, d) what are the consequences of the 6<sup>th</sup> person turning out should they be injured on an incident?
2. The protection being reviewed only after 12 months activity, should this be reduced to quarterly or 6 months.

Still to clarify

1. What payments will be made for duel contract members? In view of the fairness issues that have been raised as part of this review is it fair that a duel contract ff who works 40 hours gets paid for 60 hours when a RDS ff has to work 60 for the same pay therefore giving 50% more commitment than that of a duel contract ff?
2. Possibly not for this group but, standby arrangements need to be reviewed to ensure fairness across the organisation.

Regards

E76 RDS

---

**From:** E91 -  
**Sent:** 06 November 2016 19:20  
**To:** SHQ - Mattinson, Keith  
**Cc:**  
**Subject:** FW: RDS SALARY - OCTOBER BRIEFINGS 2016

Hi Keith,

In response to your proposed scheme I would like to offer some feedback and suggestions and I also hope you can clarify a few issues.

In terms of the 3 main objectives which are to increase pump availability, retention and recruitment, I can only see pump availability effected positively by your scheme. Recruitment will become more difficult because currently it is open to people within a 5 or 7 minute radius of the station, however realistically people who live outside a 3 minute radius will find it difficult to make the first pump therefore reducing any financial incentive for joining. Retention will also suffer if Firefighters who live furthest away from the station find they are constantly being disturbed but not being financially rewarded if they are not one of the lucky 6 who arrive on station first. This could lead to further resignations.

Under your proposed scheme there will be a number of firefighters on each station who will be financially worse off than they are currently because they will rarely be one of the first 6 on station. This was not reflected in the letters you sent to each firefighter in which you made the assumption that every attendance would be paid. This was very misleading because in reality most of these attendances would not be paid.

There is also the issue of providing relief for other pumps on larger incidents, can you provide any reassurances that RDS would still be sent or would the service just deploy whole-time pumps as this would be a cheaper option?

Due to the decline in incidents over the past few years, if this trend was to continue and your scheme proves to save money for the service in the long run, would these savings then be re-invested into the RDS?

On a positive note your scheme would provide financial compensation for firefighters who suffer from loss of earnings when responding to incidents from their primary employment. It would also reward busier stations and be seen as a positive IF co-responding is rolled out throughout the RDS.

As a suggestion I would like to propose a disturbance fee in addition to the turnout/attendance fee for any firefighter who responds but is not one of first 6. This would not penalise any firefighters who live further away from the station, it would potentially avoid resignations and avoid any ill feeling amongst firefighters if they do manage to get on the pump.

Thanks

Firefighter  
Clitheroe

---

**From:** P94 -  
**Sent:** 04 November 2016 19:56  
**To:** SHQ - Mattinson, Keith;  
**Cc:**  
**Subject:** RDS pay

Hi Keith

I have spoken to the RDS at Nelson and a couple of questions / queries have been brought up

- If more than 1 person attends a shout and they book an attendance on Gartan how will you differentiate between who attended first for payment? At the moment anyone who attends just put time of call from the turn out sheet as there attendance time.
- In Pennine Earby are the preferred station to be used for standby duties at Burnley , can this be spread out amongst the RDS units within Pennine so as not to favour Earby over the rest for any additional turn out payments that may happen.
- Although we understand the idea of 5:1 and rostering off we believe 6:2 would be a fairer ratio and allow some flexibility with regards to unforeseen circumstances and hopefully prevent those who live on the edge of the turnout area "dragging their feet ".

Regards  
P94 RDS

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** 02 November 2016 19:06  
**To:** SHQ - Mattinson, Keith  
**Subject:** Retained Pay review

Hi Keith,

First of all I would like to thank you for coming to Lancaster Station to explain the RDS pay review to us, all who attended thought the meeting was very beneficial. In the meeting you explained that you would require feedback from RDS units in order to further review the situation. Therefore I am sending this email as feedback from the whole of the RDS unit at N11, we have discussed the proposed pay system in depth and as an entire unit and our feedback is as follows:

- We all agree that the system of using a turnouts and attendances style model is a positive step forward, as it will mean that we get payed for our actual activity levels.

- We also agreed that we dislike the proposed system of only paying 5 for turning out and one for attending, we are very lucky as a unit that we commonly have 6 or more people on duty and therefore would not want to jeopardise our effectiveness at an incident because we have one less Fire fighter on the pump. Also being a new unit we still have a lot of staff in development and it is vital that all these staff get operational exposure, something which the new system could hinder. Also with Safe systems of work at incidents becoming ever more important it is vital that we ride with the maximum amount of firefighters that we can at any one time, this could also potentially mean an increase in 'make up's' at incidents so that oic's have a suitable number of Firefighters in order to put safe systems in place.
- As a unit we have agreed that the best system in our opinion would be one in which 6 firefighters got paid for turning out and 2 firefighters got paid for attending the station.

We appreciate you asking for feedback and look forward to hearing more about the RDS pay review.

Thanks  
N11 retained

---

**From:** E76 -  
**Sent:** 02 November 2016 16:36  
**To:** SHQ - Mattinson, Keith  
**Subject:** RDS Pay review

Hi Keith,

I'm a FF at Darwen on a duel contract, just had a talk on the proposed pay structure for RDS from WM and I'm emailing you with a few of my thoughts and a couple of questions that I have about it , firstly I think that it would be better to pay six people T's rather than five T's and one A ,there are a few reasons for this firstly the sixth person could be utilised by a FF in development and they could shadow various people doing different rolls and learn on the job also it would stop the temptation to speed to get to the station so you don't get an A , if you got on the pump while taking an A which will happen as we all know that the more people that you have at incidents the better this could cause problems with things like insurance if someone was unfortunate enough to have an accident , If this is a financial decision it would be outweighed by the fact that the time a pump rides at four or five much more than six.

On the salary predictions that I was given it says that I wouldn't have protection as my wage would be more, I understand that although if my actual wage is lower am I right in assuming that my pay would reflect that and so I would take home less money as you are intending on using your predictions for protection , so in reality my wage would not be protected for the first 12 months if it was less or can you reflect on wages on a monthly basis.

One last thing at the moment I attend drills as I should and I get paid for the drills in my salary on the predictions you have used Drills separately although in the new proposal you say that duel contract staff will be able to negotiate the amount of drills they need to attend with their line manager how will this have an effect on my wage and predictive wage.

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** 31 October 2016 11:22  
**To:** SHQ - Mattinson, Keith  
**Subject:** Retained Pay

Hi Keith

Having read your letter dated 7th October I have discussed this with the crew at W34 Wesham and with WM from W36 I would like to raise a couple of points

- 1) Turnouts should not be limited to 5, it should pay out to maximum 6 as a station with 50% FF in Development we ride with 6 where possible this gives FF a better opportunity to attend incidents thereby increasing their knowledge and operational skill levels. As you are aware incident levels are dropping and riding 6 gives more opportunity for FF to gain experience
- 2) On Page 6 how has the Revised Banding been calculated?
- 3) What years turnouts were taken in to consideration for this? I believe this was based on actual L34P1 mobilisation not Station area incidents we would have attended if 100% availability, as a station

that has gone through a number of leavers in the last 18 months our availability has dropped but the number of incidents hasn't. The banding should be based on Station Area Incidents not actual attendance as we recruit our availability will increase as will our attendance

Regards

W34 Wesham

---

**From:** P95 -)  
**Sent:** 31 October 2016 11:17  
**To:** SHQ - Mattinson, Keith  
**Subject:** RE: RDS SALARY - OCTOBER BRIEFINGS 2016

Hi keith

Just a update from Earby after your presentation at Burnley I answered a few questions back on Station for them, I can confirm now that Earby is 100% in favour of the new salary scheme.

Just a thought with regards to the Two pump stations , having worked the grey book system for many years at Barnoldswick it never gave much issues to the same people riding first pump etc, I am sure you will have had this conversation with others, As I see it if they have recruited within the five minute turn in time it should never create much issues so taking it in turn standing down occasionally should' nt be too much of a problem. Just my thoughts on it.

On a personal note the new system is the way forward for the RDS and a fairer system for all.

Thanks again for your time and effort with steering this forwards.

---

**From:** N12 -  
**Sent:** 24 October 2016 19:02  
**To:** SHQ - Mattinson, Keith  
**Subject:** RDS Salary Pay

Hi Keith,

Thank you for your presentation on Tuesday night. In my opinion I do feel that the new pay system is more accurate and fair across all the retained stations in Lancashire, Even though I am in a station that will currently loose pay.

However I do feel that there are a few things that can be improved to make things even more fair for all FF's across the county.

- Being paid for 5 turn outs and 1 attendance is one of my main areas for concern.
- The other is a bonus scheme for new recruits

Firstly I would like to know the reason for only 5 payments for turnouts and 1 attendance and why we have to justify why it should be paid and not the other way around ??????

We currently have 6 extremely keen fire fighters and 2 CMs in development and this in itself will cause the main problems for only getting 5 payments for turn outs. They all want to get on the machine. Some days we have 1 Wm and 3 Crew managers riding at the same time. This cannot be helped due to primary employment. We then have 4 firefighters that all joined at a very similar time. They all need and want to get on the appliance every time the machine has a shout. 1 member of staff not being paid would not stop them from getting on the machine but it then would mean we would have to determine which person would not be getting paid and this then could be seen as unfair.

If we were to deem the last person through the doors as the one that received the attendance, that person would know if they live on the edge of 5 minutes that they will never make it therefore they will turn in slower. This may be on a day when another FF cannot make it in due to a break down or an alerter failure. They may

be personnel that we have to wait for as we require the skill levels and then we would have a slower response time.

If we had to remain as 5 turnouts and 1 attendance would the 6<sup>th</sup> person who would only receive an attendance fee get the hourly rate if they were to get on the appliance and be out for more than 1 hour , for example,

If we attended a barn fire and were out for 5 hours, How would it be fair to pay 5 members of staff the turn out and the current hourly rate and the 6<sup>th</sup> FF would only get his initial attendance.

I really do understand your reasoning for not wanting to introduce a bonus scheme for long service but at Morecambe we have had quite a large turn over in staff. This without doubt will cost the service a small fortune to train and kit the individuals, I strongly believe this needs to be re visited. Even if the payment is only aimed at the new recruits joining. As an idea why not hold back some of their money from the initial course or offer a bonus payment once they have received competency or 3-5 years. I am sure there is a point at which I FFs training cost combined with the length of service will neutralise, but again with Morecambe some of our staff leave within the first 2-3 years due to, Job change, lack of turn outs, Personal Commitments or they don't fulfil their initial contract.

Regards  
Morecambe RDS

---

**From:** P96 -  
**Sent:** 22 October 2016 17:15  
**To:** SHQ - Mattinson, Keith  
**Subject:** RE: RDS PAY BRIEFINGS

Keith

A couple of points,

To stop personnel falling out and causing issues on station on a 1 pump station, if 6 are on call and have given that commitment and they get an incident

It would be easier for the unit to pay 6 turn out. Than for a manager to come in a tell someone to get off the appliance when they have shown the commitment to keep it at 6.

Plus the point from the meeting if 5 turn in before the manager and he would have to tell someone to get off this would affect morale which you we don't want to do.

Also on a 2 pump it should be 12 turnouts, we would just Roster so we only had 12 on call at the most.

This also benefits the service has they are asking us to do more, on an operational incidents and the extra cost will only be the difference between the turn out and attendance.

On calculating the Turnout and attendances should this be for only 12 months to give that figure, I think you said it's for a 17 month period if so this would give an in correct figure so increasing your salary.

Also on the calculating turn out and attendances, should this only be based on their contracted hours not on any hours they have booked on extra, has next year they not book on at all extra.

The 2 pump points so far which I can think of would be if we only have 2 managers on call or 2 drivers on call, and they turn in together , one of the managers or driver will have to stop back to keep the other appliance available, he would then get disillusioned because he would only get paid an attendance and a fire fighter getting on the machine would get a turn out and paid more than his attendance.

So on those occasions when 6 personnel get on the appliance and they are all paid a turnout if that is agreed, then a manager who has to stay back for the other appliance has to be paid a turnout.

Basically on those occasions on a 2 pump station when we have a 1 pump incident, and only 2x mangers/ Drivers on call, the service would pay 7 turnout and 5 attendances.

Regards

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** 21 October 2016 18:49  
**To:** SHQ – Mattinson, Keith  
**Subject:** Retained Pay

RDS pay moved away from paying for turnouts and attendances because finance complained that it was unable to set a budget as turnouts varied greatly from year to year.

What has changed that has now enabled finance to set a budget with a degree of certainty?

If we are going to move back to a retaining fee plus Turnouts & Attendances then 6 turnouts plus 1 attendance should be paid per incident.- There are 6 seats on a fire engine, and allowing 6 turnouts plus 1 attendance would hopefully ensure that the pump turned out fully crewed.

W36.

---

**From:** W36 -  
**Sent:** 21 October 2016 12:18  
**To:** SHQ - Mattinson, Keith  
**Subject:** W36 RDS (hybrid modle query)

Good Morning Keith

Hope you are Well

I have received my letter with regards to the propose changes for RDS Payments ( hybrid model)

Have read through the information provided my only concern was the issue of a ridership number of 5 and attendances of 1

My thoughts are that 6 should be available on a fire appliance because

- Due to lack of operational jobs, every effort should be made to ensure maximum crew numbers attend incidents to gain operational experience
- W/T Crew are only ride with 4/5, so RDS often go on make ups at large incidents
- The number of tasks on the fire ground has dramatically increased so numbers of trained personnel are imperative

Taking everything into consideration I do feel the proposed changes are beneficial and offer good value of money for the service and RDS personnel.

Thanks

---

**From:** P96 -  
**Sent:** 19 October 2016 16:15  
**To:** SHQ - Mattinson, Keith  
**Cc:**  
**Subject:** RDS PAY

Keith,

Just responding to the letter sent out regarding RDS Pay as requested if we had any points to put forward. May I first emphasize that I totally understand how much of a difficult task it has been to try and come up with a scheme that works for all and that it is virtually impossible to have a scheme that is not going to affect some personnel at some point. I also understand that a lot of hard work has also been done to get to this point. I feel that when the salary scheme came into place it was very forward thinking and other brigades were very envious of the system. I understand that it may not have quiet had the desired effect for over-all pump availability and staff retention but I feel going back to T'S and A's is taking a backward step. The general opinion on station is that wages no matter what system is put in place will do anything for pump availability and retention. People join to attend incidents, therefore activity, keeping staff busy is what will retain staff. The following are my thoughts and the thoughts from a lot of the personnel on station.

- I will start with the biggest concern from personnel – At the moment the service is all about 'thinking RDS' if we limit turn outs to 5 personnel, one person is going to miss out every time, knowing how

RDS works this potentially is going to be the same person every time. If 6 (or 12 in Colne's case) are on call why would we not allow everyone to get on and ride the pump, kicking someone off every-time or telling one person they will earn less than everyone else, would do nothing for staff retention, staff motivation and staff morale, people join the service to attend incidents, this is how we retain staff, not by telling one member they can come but can only collect an attendance fee. The point to the new scheme is to reward commitment by limiting to 5 or 10 is totally going against the whole point of the scheme. The whole-time are mostly riding with 4 these days so why would we limit a RDS pump to 5 if 6 personnel were turning in. Riding with 6 solves a lot of issues on an incident taking into account we now need managers, pump operators, BA wearers, ECO'S, Safety officers, comm's officers, BA supervisors, sector commanders, command support etc. Looking at the gartan system it is very rare that pumps would turn out with a full compliment, but if it does this can only be a good thing and everyone should be rewarded. If pumps are always turning out full then this would show the system is working and pump availability would be at an all-time high. Allowing to ride with 6 or 12 also covers holidays and sickness.

- Turn – outs favour those that live/ work nearer the station, turn-outs will encourage people to speed and drive recklessly as there is financial gain to get there first. Through 'cause and permitting' the brigade is unintentionally causing people to drive faster and recklessly for financial gain.
- Turn-outs will cause rivalries and arguments on station, and will take away the good nature of some who book on extra to catch incidents because if they live closer to the station they will be potentially taking someone else's space who should be contracted for that period and therefore taking their turn out fee.
- The attendance payment is potentially a lot lower than what most people earn at work, why would people turnout from work to be paid less for that hour they have just lost turning out if they miss the pump and only get an attendance, the gap between an attendance and a turnout needs to be smaller.
- Pensions are going to be affected on new system
- Current system allows people to get mortgage, direct debits , loans set against their wage as it is a set payment each month. Under new system guaranteed wage will be smaller and therefore less will be able to be set against it.

I know points 2-6 are just things we as a station are most likely just going to have to get used to if system is implemented, but please please consider point 1. This is not just a point that will benefit Colne but will benefit the Retained Duty System as a whole. Think 'RDS'.

Kind regards  
P96 Colne

---

**From:** N11 -  
**Sent:** 13 October 2016 09:18  
**To:** SHQ - Mattinson, Keith  
**Subject:** Hybrid pay for RDS

Good morning Keith,  
Following discussions at N16 on Tuesday night there was overwhelming support for the new hybrid model based on the figures you sent out to us. The general consensus was that this is more rewarding and a better fitting model for all at N16, and they would all like to vote for this model as opposed to the banding model we have now. There were some questions regarding times when there are 6 riders on duty( rare I know!), and turning out ( i.e. paying 5 turnouts and 1 attendance). Hornby is out on a limb somewhat, and where possible having a full crew on makes a difference when we attend difficult incidents. The question was if we turn out with 6 riders would the 6<sup>th</sup> rider get an hourly rate but no turnout fee, or would he/she get nothing for being on the appliance?  
Thanks

---



**From:** P73 –  
**Sent:** 11 October 2016 13:07  
**To:** SHQ - Mattinson, Keith  
**Cc:**  
**Subject:** RDS Pay

Hi Keith –

The 73 RDSU have received the RDS pay salary papers today. I along with other have some concerns regarding the projection figures, especially with the rule of only paying 5 Turnouts and 1 attendance.

For the fiscal year 15/16 my activity level was 63 which has been projected onto this new salary. However with losing 1 person being able to receive the projected turnouts and provisions having to be made to roster off then in effect will not receive the projection. It has to demonstrate a 17% deficit on projected activity as a minimum which would = 52 turnouts for the year (working on purely my own figures)

Obviously with reducing activity and NWFC mobilisation arrangements this is going to get significantly worse than projected unless some clarity is given on co-responding or greater use of RDS resources (such as the current trials with RDS stations picking up standby duties (Earby to Burnley Etc)

---

**From:** W36 -  
**Sent:** 11 August 2016 12:16  
**To:** SHQ - Mattinson, Keith  
**Cc:**  
**Subject:** salary

Hi Keith

I feel the revised grey book scheme will cover a few of the points you have listed.

**Fairness** cannot think of a better scheme

**Availability** I feel pump availability will increase

**Recruitment** not sure if it will effect recruitment as I have always felt if someone is joining just for the money they were not the right person for the job. May provide a bit of interest though showing you get paid extra for turning out.

**Retention** Again not sure if it will have a large impact on retention, but time will tell.

Just one point on the scheme I feel that you should set the number of people who would get a turnout/attendance at 6 as it would help personal gain experience of turning out to incidents. It would not be right if 6 came in and only 5 turnout and the sixth person gets an attendance, I feel it would not increase the budget by too much although you might tell me different.

I am against the dual contract personnel having their retaining fee increased/enhanced Thanks