

**Appendix E: Summary of Responses to On Line Consultation Questionnaire**

The following is the full detail of all responses received to the pilot of the on line questionnaire used to assist in the public consultation for the IRMP 2011/14.

The three pairs of columns on the tables represent; the overall total responses, those who indicated they were staff and those who indicated they were members of the public. The reason they do not equal the total responses is two fold; not everyone answered every question and some did not indicate to which group of people they belong. We received 31 responses to the questionnaire.

**Multiple Choice Responses to Online Consultation Questionnaire IRMP 2011/14**

<b>Question :</b>						
<b>The information within the IRMP document is clear and easy to understand?</b>						
<b>Answer Option</b>	<b>Total Response</b>	<b>Total Response %</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>	<b>Staff Response %</b>	<b>Other Response</b>	<b>Other Response %</b>
Strongly agree	<b>2</b>	<b>6.67</b>	0	0	1	7.69
Agree	<b>8</b>	<b>26.67</b>	3	33.33	2	15.38
Disagree	<b>17</b>	<b>56.67</b>	6	66.67	9	69.23
Strongly disagree	<b>3</b>	<b>10.00</b>	0	0	1	7.69
Total	<b>30</b>	<b>100%</b>	9	100%	13	100%

<b>Question: I have been provided with suitable access to information to enable me to comment about the IRMP?</b>						
<b>Answer Option</b>	<b>Total Response</b>	<b>Total Response %</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>	<b>Staff Response %</b>	<b>Other Response</b>	<b>Other Response %</b>
Strongly agree	<b>2</b>	<b>6.90</b>	1	11.11	1	7.69
Agree	<b>11</b>	<b>37.93</b>	4	44.44	5	38.46
Disagree	<b>13</b>	<b>44.83</b>	4	44.44	7	53.85
Strongly disagree	<b>3</b>	<b>10.34</b>	0	0	0	0
Total	<b>29</b>	<b>100%</b>	9	100%	13	100%

<b>Question: Have you used a service from Merseyside Fire and Rescue Service?</b>						
<b>Answer Option</b>	<b>Total Response</b>	<b>Total Response %</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>	<b>Staff Response %</b>	<b>Other Response</b>	<b>Other Response %</b>
Yes	<b>19</b>	<b>67.86</b>	4	44.44	9	75.00
No	<b>9</b>	<b>32.14</b>	5	55.56	3	25.00
Total	<b>28</b>	<b>100%</b>	9	100%	12	100%

<b>Question:</b>						
<b>How satisfied are you with Merseyside Fire and Rescue Service?</b>						
<b>Answer Option</b>	<b>Total Response</b>	<b>Total Response %</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>	<b>Staff Response %</b>	<b>Other Response</b>	<b>Other Response %</b>
Very satisfied	5	18.52	1	12.50	2	15.38
Satisfied	8	29.63	4	50.00	2	15.38
Dissatisfied	7	25.93	2	25.00	5	38.46
Very dissatisfied	4	14.81	0	0	3	23.08
Don't know	3	11.11	1	12.50	1	7.69
<b>Total</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>81%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>88%</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>85%</b>

<b>Question:</b>						
<b>To what extent do you agree that the plan sets out how we intend to make a positive difference to our community?</b>						
<b>Answer Option</b>	<b>Total Response</b>	<b>Total Response %</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>	<b>Staff Response %</b>	<b>Other Response</b>	<b>Other Response %</b>
Strongly agree	4	14.29	0	0	3	23.08
Agree	7	25.00	4	44.44	1	7.69
Disagree	13	46.43	5	55.56	6	46.15
Strongly disagree	4	14.29	0	0	3	23.08
<b>Total</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>100%</b>

<b>Question:</b>						
<b>To what extent do you agree that the plan sets out how we intend to provide an excellent and affordable service?</b>						
<b>Answer Option</b>	<b>Total Response</b>	<b>Total Response %</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>	<b>Staff Response %</b>	<b>Other Response</b>	<b>Other Response %</b>
Strongly agree	3	10.71	0	0	2	15.38
Agree	2	7.14	1	11.11	1	7.69
Disagree	17	60.71	7	77.78	6	46.15
Strongly disagree	6	21.43	1	11.11	4	30.77
Total	28	100%	9	100%	13	100%

<b>Question:</b>						
<b>To what extent do you agree that the plan sets out how we intend to deliver our services in a way that demonstrates that everyone matters?</b>						
<b>Answer Option</b>	<b>Total Response</b>	<b>Total Response %</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>	<b>Staff Response %</b>	<b>Other Response</b>	<b>Other Response %</b>
Strongly agree	3	10.71	1	11.11	2	15.38
Agree	7	25.00	2	22.22	4	30.77
Disagree	10	35.71	2	22.22	5	38.46
Strongly disagree	8	28.57	4	44.44	2	15.38
Total	28	100%	9	100%	13	100%

<b>Question:</b>						
<b>To what extent do you agree that the plan sets out how we intend to respect our environment?</b>						
<b>Answer Option</b>	<b>Total Response</b>	<b>Total Response %</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>	<b>Staff Response %</b>	<b>Other Response</b>	<b>Other Response %</b>
Strongly agree	5	17.86	1	11.11	2	15.38
Agree	14	50.00	6	66.67	5	38.46
Disagree	6	21.43	1	11.11	5	38.46
Strongly disagree	3	10.71	1	11.11	1	7.69
Total	28	100%	9	100%	13	100%

<b>Question:</b>						
<b>To what extent do you agree that the plan sets out how we intend to make sure that our people are the best they can be?</b>						
<b>Answer Option</b>	<b>Total Response</b>	<b>Total Response %</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>	<b>Staff Response %</b>	<b>Other Response</b>	<b>Other Response %</b>
Strongly agree	3	10.71	2	22.22	1	7.69
Agree	11	39.29	3	33.33	6	46.15
Disagree	6	21.43	2	22.22	4	30.77
Strongly disagree	8	28.57	2	22.22	2	15.38
Total	28	100%	9	100%	13	100%

<b>Question: Would you be prepared to assist MFRS with future consultation?</b>						
<b>Answer Option</b>	<b>Total Response</b>	<b>Total Response %</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>	<b>Staff Response %</b>	<b>Other Response</b>	<b>Other Response %</b>
Yes	6	21.43	2	22.22	3	23.08
No	22	78.57	7	77.78	10	76.92
Total	28	100%	9	100%	13	100%

<b>Question: Gender</b>						
<b>Answer Option</b>	<b>Total Response</b>	<b>Total Response %</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>	<b>Staff Response %</b>	<b>Other Response</b>	<b>Other Response %</b>
Female	5	19.23	0	0	5	38.46
Male	21	80.77	9	100.00	8	61.54
Total	26	100%	9	100%	13	100%

<b>Question: Which age group do you belong to?</b>						
<b>Answer Option</b>	<b>Total Response</b>	<b>Total Response %</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>	<b>Staff Response %</b>	<b>Other Response</b>	<b>Other Response %</b>
Under 25	0	0	0	0	0	0
25 - 34	1	4.00	0	0	1	7.69
35 - 44	12	48.00	3	33.33	8	61.54
45 - 54	10	40.00	6	66.67	2	15.38
55 or above	2	8.00	0	0	2	15.38
Total	25	100%	9	100%	13	100%

<b>Question : Do you consider yourself to have a disability?</b>						
<b>Answer Option</b>	<b>Total Response</b>	<b>Total Response %</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>	<b>Staff Response %</b>	<b>Other Response</b>	<b>Other Response %</b>
Yes	3	11.54	0	0	2	15.38
No	23	88.46	9	100.00	11	84.62
Total	26	100%	9	100%	13	100%

<b>Question : Status</b>						
<b>Answer Option</b>	<b>Total Response</b>	<b>Total Response %</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>	<b>Staff Response %</b>	<b>Other Response</b>	<b>Other Response %</b>
Elected Member	0	0	0	0	0	0
Member of the Public	14	58.33	0	0	14	93.33
Representative of a Business	1	4.17	0	0	1	6.67
Member of Staff (MFRS)	9	37.50	9	100.00	0	0
Representative of a community group	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	24	100%	9	100%	15	100%

<b>Question : Ethnicity</b>						
<b>Answer Option</b>	<b>Total Response</b>	<b>Total Response %</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>	<b>Staff Response %</b>	<b>Other Response</b>	<b>Other Response %</b>
White British	<b>21</b>	<b>84.00</b>	8	88.89	13	76.47
White Irish	<b>1</b>	<b>4.00</b>	1	11.11	1	5.88
Other White	<b>1</b>	<b>4.00</b>	0	0	1	5.88
Black (Caribbean, African)	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	0	0	0	0
Black British	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	0	0	0	0
Other Black	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	0	0	0	0
Mixed White and Black Caribbean	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	0	0	0	0
Mixed White and Black African	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	0	0	0	0
Other Mixed	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	0	0	0	0
Asian (Indian, Pakistani, Bangladeshi)	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	0	0	0	0
Asian British	<b>1</b>	<b>4.00</b>	0	0	1	5.88
Other Asian	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	0	0	0	0
Chinese	<b>1</b>	<b>4.00</b>	0	0	1	5.88
<b>Total</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>100%</b>	9	100%	17	100%



**Free Narrative Responses to Online Consultation Questionnaire**  
**IRMP 2011/14**

**Do you have any comments on the size, structure and language used within the document?**

The text is easy to read but there is so much in there, and very little real information. It is almost a "spin" document, sounds very good but no real substance.

Lots of jargon used, words like 'mutuality'. Should be in plain English

A lot of technical jargon is used, plain English needs to be adopted.

Too vague, lacks clarity and specific detail and therefore is open to manipulation and personal interpretation. Corporate mumbo jumbo.

A VERY GLOSSY AND EXPENSIVE LOOKING PUBLICATION THAT PROBABLY COULD BE PRODUCED FAR MORE CHEAPLY.

A shorter summary would be useful for public consumption

No

Background use of colour makes it difficult to tread. It is too much led by statistics and not enough real people and human elements.

I am afraid due to alternative central Government statistics, figures etc which are available to anyone show very varied and puzzling differences.

Statistics shown could be seen as misleading

some information seems to be misleading to the untrained eye!

Very flowery words with no real substance. Just sounds like government spin again!

detail was adequate, but it would be best to present a couple of quick bullet points

I think a 2 document approach would be better 1 stating facts in a punchy manner. the other setting out long hand the full detail. This way lots more will read the content and not be put off by the size of the booklet.

**Do you have any comments regarding the information within the IRMP document?**

As above, very little real substance, it all sounds wonderful but reality is probably different.

Statistics are very easy to adapt to put a certain argument together. I think this has happened here.

Again, lacking real clarity on specific details, lies damn lies and statistics, this looks like a glossy publication but no real information given.

I THINK THAT THE SERVICE SHOULD CONCENTRATE ON ITS PRIMARY ROLES AND DROP ALL OF THE SO CALLED INITIATIVES THAT ARE TAKING VALUABLE RESOURCES AND MONEY AWAY.

The information is clear and easy to read

Seems to focus on quantities and not qualities of service. Numbers not people. Time spent on one individual can reap benefits beyond its single figure on a spreadsheet. How much time was really spent with people in some areas to understand their needs. I feel the statistics dictate where resources are placed and not areas that are as deprived but not without a history or fire setting. It rewards areas with high fire statistics.

insufficient for proper consultation

Once again it seems that a reduction in the service will result from this.

vagueness of information supplied

Statistics within the document are presented in a way so that the naked eye see them as favorable, once time is spent reading deeper into graphs etc, results provided are not as good as first thought.

Misleading bar chart used to give the impression that accidental fires have halved.

No hard facts how things will affect general public. There will obviously be cuts but it has all been hidden. I fear there will be a much reduced front line service but this isn't admitted to.

**Do you have any comments regarding your level of satisfaction with Merseyside Fire and Rescue Service?**

Concerned at reductions in front line appliances and staff, seems to be a delay in responding and some calls are being ignored altogether. Seem to be spending more time producing fancy brochures and meeting targets instead of sticking to the core business.

civilian staff with no credibility pretending to have experience of the effects of fires.

I live in an area which is covered by a " low level response" , on the occasion I had to use the service I believe I had to wait an unreasonable length of time for response.y council tax hasn't reduced but my service has.

They seem to want to become social workers and jack of all trades, they should stick to their main purpose, emergency service.

Fire Safety Legislation is confusing. The information on the website is in some cases outdated and at least some areas inaccurate. The Law changed in 2005 to the RRO. There was no real engagement with commerce and the level of assistance varies accross areas of Merseyside. My business recieves varied levels of advise and guidance.

The constant reduction in service and increase in cost linked with the removal of frontline firefighters who are my insurance policy is not the service i require. I wish a fully funded immediately available service that can respond straight away to whatever emergency i have and arrive without delay in the shortest possible time that is not the service the IRMP is proposing

The number of Firefighters has severly reduced over the past 5-8 yrs, as has fire cover accross merseyside with appliances continually being left stood idle in engine houses due to a cronic shortage of operational staff. A recruitment drive needs to be drawn up to try and maintian an already depleted work force over the coming years.

It took longer than I expected for a fire engine to arrive. The firemen said they hadn't come form the nearest station because that fire engine was at another call and the other fire engine from the nearest station didn't have enough firemen for it to be used

I am concerned that you seem to be increasing the office based staff at the expense of the frontline services and fire engines.My parents are both elderley pensioners who live in Maghull, the cover in this area is reduced greatly after 10.00 at night i also understand that fire engines in Kirkby and Crosby are regularly not available due to staff shortages.

alarming rate of appliances unavailable on a regular basis

During floods I was informed Fire Service couldnt assist. My home was under water, electricity supply affected and they wouldnt even try to help. I found out afterwards that none of the local fire stations were busy at the time. I was under the impression I was paying my council tax to provide an emergency service, not producing glossy brochures.

I had smoke alarms fitted in my old house, and the guys were friendly and informative

**Do you have any comments regarding this core value? positive difference**

Just have the provision to put out fires and rescue people there are already enough overlapping local authority and charity services that perform the task better

I think in a time of "watching the pennies" I think the fire service should concentrate on doing what it has always done well that is keeping merseyside safe, and not trying to undermine other services.

Stick to your purpose of what the tax payers want, fire engines and firefighters responding IMMEDIATELY!

THE CORE VALUE SHOULD BE TO HELP AND ASSIST PEOPLE WHEN REQUIRED BY PROVIDING AN EFFICIENT QUALITY SERVICE

How can the core values be of any value when the number of staff in headquarters at hatton garden has "Hundreds and hundreds of day office people and 16 fire engines were not available last week and every night at least 6 engines are parked up because there is not enough firemen. Too many backroom staff, I pay fo fire engines not paper pushers

This is based on a one sided singular view of society

Shortage of operational staff and front line fire appliances left idle in engine houses leaves the local community in danger in the event of an emergency, therefore having a negative difference upon the community.

I don't think diversifying the role of the fire brigade should take place at a time when budgets are being cut. More admin staff to to run these areas at a time when the numbers of firemen are being cut doesn't make much sense to me. Surely the fire brigade should be concentrating on their own core values instead of moving into other areas?

Generally most of my friends and family would be happier seeing the number of Fire Engines maintained and not decreased even if it means an increase on their Council Tax. Ideally the best place to make savings in most organisations like yours is to look at the number of senior managers employed. Liverpool Council have only today announced that they will be halving the number of their senior managers from 74 to 42.

Didn't make any difference to my community when we were flooded! Should spend more time getting back to basics and stop worrying about all this propaganda.

I think that the fire service is taking on roles that are better done elsewhere.

**Do you have any comments regarding this core value? provide an excellent and affordable service?**

The service provided is a lesser service than several years ago. Less operational staff and fewer appliances cannot be regarded as an excellent service.

reducing frontline staff is not an excellent service

Wasteful duplication of service provided by other agencies.

Again I go back to my previous point "my council tax has never reduced but my service has". Why does the service cost more now when personnel numbers are at an all-time low. It is often said that cuts are required but these only happen at the operational level

Stop all the unnecessary frills that carry bonuses and awards for managers and councillors and get back to spending grants and council tax and the emergency service, all the other claptrap is seen for what it is.

**THIS SHOULD BE THE PRIMARY VALUE!!!**

Impending cuts in the public sector leave me feeling there may be front line savings over backroom jobs for instance in statistics departments.

fire cover approved by the authority in its last irmp very rarely achieved

statistics lies and damned lies. 25 minutes to get to a garage fire in melling and no apology to the community or owner

It is not about seeking acclamation, it is about the service you give and what the people expect and it is certainly not about the affordability.

service delivery should be fire engines and firefighters

Your reduction in staff and fire appliances leaves us with a far from excellent service, and the public still pay the same amount of council tax for reduced fire cover in the coming years.

Less firemen will mean less fire engines. Less fire engines will mean somebody, somewhere will have to wait longer for a fire engine to arrive than they would have a few years ago. How can this be progress?

Again it puzzles me how you intend to provide an excellent service when you are talking about reducing not only the number of fire engines and firefighters available, but also the times they will be available for.

there is not enough emphasis put on front line services as opposed to community services

more investment required to maintain service

As above!!! What point is there having all the equipment and fire engines if you choose not to use them! I am also led to believe that a lot of the fire engines are not fully staffed most of the time and a lot of them are not staffed at all. Its a disgrace.

**Do you have any comments regarding this core value? everyone matters**

Whilst the brochures depict a feeling that everyone matters, people who work for the organisation are regarded as second class citizens with little or no say in how things should be done. A growing dissatisfaction amongst the whole workforce is not a good or healthy sign. The growing use of temporary contracts amongst staff offers little security and even less job satisfaction.

Everyone matters as long as you agree!

Animal farm- it is the undisputed case that in MF&RS some people matter more than others and this corrupted loyalty leads to poor decision making and prejudice and bias which ultimately costs the tax payer money.

**THIS IS JUST POLITICAL SPEAK!!" JUST CONCENTRATE ON PROVIDING AN EFFICIENT FIRE SERVICE!!**

Absolutely agree.

typical left wing tory labour government speak which disguises reality

Everyone should matter equally but they don't in the practical application of your policies

I would like to know what percentage of your staff are classed as disabled or have learning difficulties. You seem to talk about minority groups but I did not see any details regarding how many staff who could be covered by the above descriptions are employed in your service.

a lot of what is done seems to be done piece-meal with no coherent strategy

listen more to your employee's views

The way you treat your staff leaves a lot to be desired.

I don't know how this will happen.

**Do you have any comments regarding this core value? respect our environment?**

sending appliances that do 4-6 mpg to do smoke alarms is costing approx £50 per day per appliance this is not reducing the carbon footprint of the service

You do it because you have too.

Hundreds of fire engines movements per day 24/7 365 days a year at 4 miles per gallon red buses does not equal environmentally respectful. 2 men in a van in each station area would do the same much cheaper and planet friendly or are the fire engines run on bio fuel?

massive amount of wastage from self generated opinions on what is good for the environment

The aim to continue with the community fire safety strategy using "Gas" Guzzling fire appliances as a means of getting round doing no more than 8 miles to the gallon seems absurd after making a statement such as "respecting our environment"

Sending a big fire engine out to change the battery in a smoke alarm surely cannot be considered 'Green'?

I do not know how efficient Fire Engines are but i think smaller vehicles being used to visit houses to install smoke alarms would probably save a small fortune in diesel bills.

**Do you have any comments regarding this core value? our people are the best they can be?**

See q13 above. A large variation in available opportunity to the workforce. Some people seem to be chosen for plum training courses and qualifications whilst others are refused for no apparent reason.

If the best is expected out of people they must feel valued, appreciated and respected. If the service faces a reduction in staff surely the workload on the remaining staff will increase what measures will be put in place?

You want SOME of your staff and SOME of your volunteers to get on. Due to the management style and the lack of opposition to this style from councillors the elitist two tier system in MF&RS is allowed to thrive and only when legal challenges are sought and won do MF&RS have to lick their wounds. Again this is at the expense of the tax payer.

Again, actions speak louder than words. Is it true no one gets promoted if they are in the Fire Union?

ask you frontline employees what they really think without having to put their names to it

Although i agree that volunteers can be a great help,i am very wary of becoming reliant on a voluntary resource.Also unfortunately in this day and age some criminal elements may try to take advantage by posing as representratives of the fire brigade,(i think i have already read of this happening in the local press)

in recent years there seems to be a drop in standards in personnel with what appears to be a lot of politically motivated appointments

There seems to be little or no recruitment and therefore no continuity. You have an ageing workforce with little fresh blood coming in. Senior managers are same old network who are obviously just looking after themselevs and their friends.