HAZELWOOD MINE FIRE INQUIRY

Submission cover sheet

Post your submission with this cover sheet to:

Submissions Hazelwood Mine Fire Inquiry PO Box 3460 GIPPSLAND MC Vic 3841

Email your submission with this cover sheet to info@hazelwoodinquiry.vic.gov.au.

Title: MR	First Name:		Surname: JOHN				
Organisation represente							
Email address:							
Postal address:			morwell	3840			
Telephone		Mobile:					
☑ Origin and circumstances of fire		Response to fire by:					
✓ Measures by Hazelwood Coal Mine to prevent		☐ Hazelwood Coal Mine					
fire		☐ Emergency Services					
🕱 Application and administration of regulatory		☐ Environmental Agencies					
regimes		☐ Public Health Officials					
Other (please state)		☐ Other Government Agencies					
Confidentiality The Inquiry will consider all requests for confidentiality. Should you wish for your submission or parts of your submission, to be treated as confidential, please clearly state the reason in the space provided below. If you require more room, please attach a separate page and provide together with your submission. Should the Inquiry consider the request for confidentiality not to be appropriate you will be provided with an opportunity to withdraw your submission or re-submit it in a form suitable for publication.							
Please select one of the following options ✓ I acknowledge that my submission will be treated as a public document and may be published, quoted or summarised by the Inquiry. OR ☐ I request that my submission or parts of my submission, be treated as confidential, and not published quoted or summarised by the Inquiry, for reasons stated below							

Acknowledgements

I understand that:

- I can be contacted by the Inquiry in relation to my submission.
- Anonymous submission will not be accepted.
- The name or worn or suburb of each submitter will be identified as apart of every published submission. Other contact details will be removed before publishing.
- The Inquiry will not publish submission, if it believes that the submission material is or could be defamatory, offensive, contravenes, anti-discrimination or anti-vilification legislation or is outside the scope of the Inquiry's terms of reference

Signature A. John		1 11	<u> </u>	
OR if sending electronically please confirm your acknowle	edgment by ticking by box \square	Date	12-5-	2014

- The reason I am placing this submission is to highlight my rersonal experience of trauma of the affects of the Hazelwood Coal Mine fire, leading up to, during and after the fire, with the knowledge of;

· The present state of emergency services within the mine, · The point at which the decision for, mine fire service removal, and progressive removal of water reticulation systems, was made.

" The lack of regulation, code of Practice by all parties pertaining to the mining operations contract.

The major reason is the tack of Safety Provisions, including Evacuation of 10,000 people, provided to the Community. This showed no Duty of Care, in any society, by the Government.

In relation to the Terms of Leberence, in my experience enduring the Coal Mine fire, information digested and my response progressively as each day unfolded, some reference is based and/or derived from Media information.

- 1. The origin of the Rive, or assonist is unknown.
 - · When, exactly was the mine first reported to have ignited and how long was the response time to notify the community.
 - "With the knowledge of mine operations/mine fire service and the state of the mine contract excluding 'in house' live service specifically trained for Open Cut Coal Mine lives, I could see clearly what was going to happen rest.
 - · I was contantly, for 5 days, contacting ABC Radio to keep them one (4) step ahead to enable information disemination to be at it's best, correct.
- B. There was no trained fire series to combat the Coal Mine type of fire.
 - · Helicopters are inefficient with steep slopes.
 - · On the fourth (4th) day, there was no fire Righting resource, whatsoever, at the Coal Mine.
 - · CFA and MFB had no plan to combact Coal Mine Fire.
 - · No Leadership presented itself. It is fett the relevant MP was obligated to provide Safety Provision for the community.

- The Government appeared to lack in a 'Duty of Care' with no intent to evacuate 10,000 people, nor evaluate the need for evacuation, nor reference to 'Safety Provision' for 10,000 people.
- "Immediate respite for Morwell was impossible for those with no means of transport, unless they walked.
- · When I rang for Morwell respite centre, I was told to go to Moe. The informing Authority was geographically unaware that the fire was between Morwell and Moe and trains and roads were closed.

Travalgor respite centre meant a 15 km walk.

- · Unreliable EPA air quality information was diseminated to the community.
- * Public swing began mistrusting information. This was easily brought about by the Public feeling 'left out on limb 'or forgotten about which has been the feeling of Morwell residents for many years.
- · ABC transmitted message from Government Health Official regarding the impact on the affected community was misleading.
- · Dust masks are inadequate for respiratory protection required during exposure to particulates.
- · Dust masks did NOT pit any children, or babies.
- · Public meetings were chaotic. The was a lock of Leadership.

- · Public meetings had no information to be able to report back,
- · There was no call for a State of Emergency with regard to Safety Provision for the Affected Community.
- "What constitutes a call for a' State of Emergency' with regard to Government 'Duty of Care' fo 'Safety Provision'?
- "What Regulatory Statutes refer to; Evacuation of 10,000 people and to; 'Action Plan for Energencies?
- · No Evacuation Assessment was done.
- · Local services (with worked with set parameters.
- of the Electrical Trades Union, at all relevant meetings in the lead-up to, and eventual sale of the Marwell Open Cut Coal Mine in conjunction with other relevant Union Officials, and Management of State Electricity Commission of Victoria responsible for the sale of the mine.
- · The original 'Tender For Sale' omitted five service and included 'progressive removal' of water reticulation infrastructure by the new company.

- The find meeting with SECV management in relation to the Mine scale, informed all parties present 'the new company will provide fire service in the mine' and all water reticulation hardware will be 'progressively removed' by the company owning the mine contract'.
- · All detail of Sale Tenders and Agreed Sale Contracts were set by the Kennett Government
- The omission of fire services and removal of water reticulation infrastructure was a directive from the responsible Government of the day.

Concerns:

- "What constitutes a State of Emergency with Safety Provision for 10,000 residents. Evacuation was necessary.
- · There is a requirement for Action Plan For Emergencies' be set by a Task Force.
- " The Task Force must be Nationally Based and specific to the cause of the natural disaster.
- · Such instrumentalities relating to 'Essential Services Act' must be regulatory bound providing Safety Provision under Code of Practice.
- · All parties to the mine contract and licence are responsible parties in the case of this type of fire.
- removal of water reticulation infrastructure.

 The hardware was not in the way of mine operations and did not need to be removed.
- · Need for mine management plan
- " Lack of Health Provision where every verson was accounted for.