

From: Paul Reynolds
To: [LCSC](#)
Subject: Fire Service Reform
Date: Friday, 7 July 2017 3:37:27 PM

Dear Sir/Madam

I am writing to show my support for the proposed Fire Service Reform.

I have been a career firefighter with the MFB for 12 years. I live in Malvern East and am very happy for the emergency services that are available where I live.

My parents however, live in Chelsea, which is a designated CFA area, so as a result, in any emergency, they only get a volunteer response. Being that they are approaching 70 years of age, I find it astonishing, that even though they are in a very residential area, an EMR response from professional firefighters with a 90 second turnout time and advanced life saving equipment including oxygen and a defibrillator, is not something they can hope for. Why is human life in Malvern given the best chance of survival, whereas it is not in Chelsea? I would understand if Chelsea were rural but it isn't.

Why are some residential areas given a minimum response of a 90 second turnout with 7 professional firefighters that can wear Breathing Apparatus and do internal firefighting and rescues from burning buildings, whereas some just as heavily populated residential areas, are not given a minimum response time and even then, the firefighters that come, in all probability, are not trained for Breathing Apparatus or internal rescues? Is some life cheaper than others? I am glad I live in an area that determines my life, my family and my property is more essential to save, than someone only 15 kilometres from me!

I fully support Fire Service Reform so that other people living in heavily populated areas are given a professionally trained and equipped response instead of a response that may have been deemed sufficient in 1958 when an area was in its primacy of a growth corridor.

Thanking you kindly,

Paul Reynolds

