TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

The attached transcript, while an accurate recording of evidence given in the course of the hearing day, is not proofread prior to circulation and thus may contain minor errors.

2015/16 HAZELWOOD MINE FIRE INQUIRY

MELBOURNE

THURSDAY, 6 AUGUST 2015

BEFORE:

THE HONOURABLE BERNARD TEAGUE AO - Chairman

MRS ANITA ROPER - Board Member

MR PETER ROZEN - Counsel Assisting

MR RICHARD ATTIWILL QC - State of Victoria

MS RENEE SION - State of Victoria

MR ROBERT TAYLOR - Alcoa of Australia

Telephone: 8628 5555 Facsimile: 9642 5185

1	CHAIRMAN:	Yes.	Mr	Rozen.
_	C1117 T T T (T-117 711 •	100,	T-T-T	1102011.

2.2

2.8

MR ROZEN: Good morning, chair; good morning, Mrs Roper.

The purpose of today's hopefully brief hearing will be to enable the parties and myself to make some brief submissions about what we consider the board ought to do by way of findings arising from the public hearings which were held in Anglesea last week.

A document setting out the final submissions of Counsel Assisting has been circulated to the parties and I have had some brief discussions with counsel representing both the State of Victoria and Alcoa.

I note that there are people in the room who were not in the hearing at Anglesea, and in those circumstances, at the risk of reading out something that people probably will have read, I propose to read through that document.

CHAIRMAN: That's appropriate if that is the case.

OZEN: I should also indicate that the document from which I'm reading will be uploaded onto the inquiry website so that it will be available if anyone wants to read it in any more detail. I'm obviously not going to be going to each of the references that I've included in the submissions, but they of course will be there for anyone that wants to follow those up.

The references, I should add, are to items of evidence in the transcript which are either on the website or in the process of being uploaded to the website.

If I could start with a few short words about the inquiry itself. This board of inquiry was established under s.53 of the Inquiries Act 2014 by Order in

Council dated 26 May 2015.

By paragraph 11 of its terms of reference, the board is required to inquire into and report to the Governor no later than 31 August 2015 about "sustainable, practical and effective options that could be undertaken by the mine operator to decrease the risk of fire arising from or impacting the Anglesea Mine for the 2015/2016 summer season, noting the impending closure of the mine on 31 August 2015".

In my submission the following aspects of this term of reference are noteworthy: firstly, the investigation by the board is limited to options that could be taken by Alcoa alone as the mine operator.

Secondly, the concern is with the risk of fire both arising from the mine and impacting on it, for example by ember attack.

Thirdly, the scope of the inquiry is limited temporally to the 2015/2016 summer season.

As part of the inquiry process, members of the board and the inquiry staff have visited the Anglesea Mine and met with Alcoa managers. The board has consulted with the local community at an open community forum, and it has received and read several written submissions from individuals and organisations.

Finally, the board heard two days of evidence at a public hearing at Anglesea last week on 30 and 31 July. At the public hearing the board heard from Alcoa managers, government regulators, emergency services personnel and expert witnesses.

The inquiry is clearly conducted against the backdrop and in the context of the disastrous Hazelwood

Mine Fire of February/March 2014. That fire was the subject of a separate board of inquiry that reported in August 2014. All of the evidence before that earlier inquiry is taken to be evidence before the current board.

The Anglesea and Hazelwood coal mines. As the evidence before the board has made clear, there are significant differences between the Anglesea Mine and the Hazelwood Mine. Importantly, these differences are such that the fire risks associated with the Anglesea Mine are considerably lower than those associated with its Hazelwood counterpart. The differences include that the Anglesea Mine is far smaller than the Hazelwood Mine.

The overburden to coal ratio is far greater at Anglesea and this has facilitated progressive remediation of the Anglesea Mine.

The moisture content of the coal mine at Anglesea is higher than that mined in the Latrobe Valley and the coal has less potential for spontaneous combustion.

By contrast to the history of significant fires at Hazelwood, there have been very few fires at Anglesea and none that has impacted on the coal or required the attendance of the CFA.

Contrary to the experience of Hazelwood on 9 February 2014 the extreme Ash Wednesday fire of 1983, which of course burnt in the Anglesea area, did not result in ignition of the coal at Anglesea even though there was some spotting into the mine.

The Anglesea Mine is subject to a lower level of occupational health and safety regulation compared to

the Hazelwood Mine by virtue of not being a prescribed mine under the Occupational Health and Safety Regulations. The board heard evidence that this is on the basis of an assessment by the regulator, the Victorian WorkCover Authority, that the Anglesea Mine presents a lower level of risk than the Hazelwood Mine.

Further, closure of the mine on 31 August 2015 will significantly reduce its risk profile, according to Mr Lapsley, the State's Emergency Management Commissioner. This view is supported by the Alcoa risk assessment dated July 2015 which is in evidence.

As noted above, the inquiry heard from two expert witnesses: they were mining engineer, Cameron

Farrington of Mining One Consultants, and bushfire risk consultant, Rod Incoll. Mr Farrington had been engaged through Mining One Consultants by Alcoa to assess its strategies; Mr Incoll was engaged directly by the board.

In relation to the risk of fire arising from the Anglesea Mine, Mr Farrington and Mr Incoll both examined the risk of a fire resulting from spontaneous combustion of the coal. Mr Rolland of Alcoa informed the inquiry that there is some history of such fires, although only three have resulted in what he called "flame events". Most such events have involved "steamy coal" short of open flame.

Mr Incoll, the board's bushfire risk consultant, considered that it was unlikely that a fire would commence due to spontaneous combustion or as a result of worker carelessness or non-observance of permit conditions.

2.2

2.8

In relation to the western coalface, which I will refer to in a moment, Mr Incoll rated the probability of fire as rare. Mr Farrington also considered fire from spontaneous combustion as being unlikely. The Alcoa risk assessment of July of this year reached similar conclusions about the risk of fire arising from the mine.

As far as the risk of fire impacting on the mine is concerned, Mr Incoll examined the risk of mine fire caused by ember or ash attack and, as the board will of course be aware, this was the cause of the Hazelwood Mine fire, that is, embers from outside the mine being thrown into it during a bushfire and igniting the coal.

After examining the history of planned burning in the Anglesea heath to the north and west of the Anglesea Mine, Mr Incoll opined that the likelihood of a high intensity bushfire impacting the Anglesea Mine during the 2015/16 fire season is considered to be rare.

Referring to both the risk of fire from within the mine and from outside the mine, Mr Incoll concluded, and I quote from his report, "The analysis of fire risk on the mine site after 31 August 2015 has indicated that, at the worst case, a fire outbreak in coal or vegetation at the mine after shutdown is 'unlikely', and should an incident occur any risk of fire spread beyond the mine is insignificant."

CHAIRMAN: Could I just interrupt there to in effect make the point that, because these are submissions, you don't have to cover the sort of things that a report would cover, but I think it's highly likely that there

would be reference in the report to the matters raised by Mr Incoll about the high risk of fire in the Otways generally, and to prescribed burning, for the kind of reason that is underlined in the Black Saturday Royal Commission, that there's a kind of forgetfulness of what can happen and a complacency that may arise therefrom, and if one reads it without reference to that, there isn't, I think, the appreciation of what always is in my mind, that the Dandenongs and the Otways, for reasons that Mr Incoll has referred to, just are a major cause for concern compared with other parts of Victoria, and the prescribed burning is an aspect of dealing with those that impacts upon the risk of fire.

You're not saying that they shouldn't be included, your just saying, well, you haven't specifically included them because you're really rather fixedly going to the matters that have been of particular concern.

MR ROZEN: Yes, that's correct, chair. I should add that, even though the terms of reference do rather focus the minds of the board on the mine - - -

CHAIRMAN: It's clearly the particular focus is this coming fire season, but one can't say that the potential risk - we've referred to Ash Wednesday and you've got a brief reference to Ash Wednesday, but it's that overall picture, that complacency concern that stems from southeastern Australia, being the most fire risk prone area of the world, in my opinion, and the Dandenongs and Otways just being one of the higher risk areas that needs to be focused on. I didn't happen to have

Mr Lapsley's here, but I have an idea that, if he hasn't put it in, it's not because he doesn't think that way because I've heard him speak on the subject in other circumstances.

ROZEN: I was just going to add that, even though the terms of reference focus the minds of the board on the mine itself, it's somewhat artificial to look at the mine not in the context of the surrounding area that it's in, particularly the evidence that we've heard about the heath.

If I could turn then to Alcoa's strategy for minimising the risk of fire after the closure of the mine on 31 August 2015. The evidence before the board establishes that Alcoa is in the process of implementing a detailed and comprehensive strategy for minimising the risk of fire at the mine post closure. The strategy includes the following features: covering most of the exposed coal through what's been referred to in the evidence as the overburden strategy; updating the internal risk assessments; updating the Alcoa emergency plan; co-operating with the CFA in updating the CFA's pre-incident plan and addressing practical issues such as access to water for firefighting; updating the Alcoa standard work instruction for mine coal fires and hot coal procedure; and putting in place staffing arrangements addressing site security, plant maintenance and operation and the implementation of the Mining One recommendations concerning inspection of the mine post closure. I'll come to those in a moment.

The key plank in the strategy, in my submission, is the overburden strategy. This consists of covering

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

26

27

2.8

29

30

most of the exposed coal at the mine, some 41 hectares, with a metre of overburden. The evidence is that that overburden is soil with a significant clay content.

This strategy has been the subject of detailed assessment by Mining One Consultants through
Mr Farrington, the mining engineer. Mining One considered the quantity and quality of the overburden being used and ultimately endorsed the strategy.

Mr Farrington has "endorsed the minimum capping levels as ongoing monitoring provides an opportunity to identify any problematic areas". He explains that, if there are problem areas, the one metre of capping is easily removed to access the area to be addressed.

Mr Incoll endorsed the Mining One assessment. Similarly, the overburden strategy has been endorsed by Alcoa's Global Mining Centre of Expertise.

As at the date that the hearing concluded, which was last Friday, 31 July, Alcoa had capped 23 hectares of the coal. Alcoa expects the mine floor will be covered by 31 August 2015, and it is sourcing external contracted earthmoving support to ensure that this is the case.

It is important to note that some of the coal will not be covered. Alcoa told the inquiry that due to a combination of time constraints and its proximity to the approved Cultural Heritage Management Plan boundary, an area of exposed vertical coal, known as the west wall, will not be covered before 31 August 2015.

Mining One expressed the view that the long term exposure of this coal presents minimal combustion risk,

and it proposed that the vertical faces be left exposed in the period between the interim closure work and final rehabilitation.

However, as Mining One explained, if this is in fact done, Alcoa needs to ensure the following: that an inspection regime is implemented as detailed on pages 21-23 of the Mining One report; that a water cart and an appropriate management strategy for tackling any coal fire and spontaneous combustion must be maintained on site; and what was referred to as a Target Action Response Plan (or TARP) is developed. The TARP should address the risks of fire, for example from a bushfire in the vicinity, and should outline appropriate responses that will be implemented.

One of the clear themes in the evidence is that most, if not all, of the work Alcoa is doing to mitigate the risk of fire post closure is presently incomplete. Alcoa has helpfully provided a table, a document dated 29 July 2015 to the inquiry which sets out 39 recommendations made variously by Mining One, Mr Incoll, Robert Barry of the CFA and Ross McGowan of the Earth Resources Regulations department.

In relation to each recommendation Alcoa has set out what it intends to do to implement the recommendation. In the majority of cases the date by which the work is to be completed is 31 August 2015, the date of mine closure.

With the reporting date of the same date,
31 August 2015, and time needed to write the report,
the board will not hear new evidence after
31 July 2015. This means that it will not hear

evidence of the outcomes of the various scheduled meetings and other work that will be done by Alcoa and the various government agencies that regulate and interact with Alcoa during August. For example, the inquiry has been told that the CFA pre-incident plan was to be discussed and revisions finalised by Alcoa and the CFA on 3 August 2015, which was last Monday. The Alcoa emergency plan was also to be discussed at that meeting and Alcoa set a target date of 14 August 2015 for finalisation of that plan.

The inquiry was told that Alcoa was yet to make final decisions about who will maintain and operate its equipment on site, including its firefighting equipment.

We were told that Alcoa is developing the TARP, the Target Action Response Plan recommended by Mr Farrington of Mining One, and in particular is considering what needs to be in place by way of pre-planning on days of high fire danger.

Finally, Alcoa is yet to engage trained security officers who will have the important tasks of inspecting the overburden, escorting the CFA in an emergency and addressing any spontaneous combustion events that might occur.

Simply put, the board cannot know what has been and will be done after 31 July 2015. What should the board do to address this knowledge gap?

It's my submission that the answer to this important question is to be found in the evidence that the board has heard. A clear theme in the evidence is that, as the well respected and highly experienced

Emergency Management Commissioner Mr Lapsley put it, Alcoa is "a good corporate citizen within the community".

The senior officers of the government agencies that regulate and interact with Alcoa have echoed these sentiments in their evidence. The board heard from Ross McGowan, the Executive Director of the Earth Resources Regulation branch, the principal mining regulator in this State. He said that he had been "extremely satisfied" about his interaction with Alcoa.

Similarly, Robert Barry, assistant chief officer with the CFA, said that, "Alcoa are very positive in their arrangements with the CFA for post closure."

Highly experienced bushfire risk consultant, Rod Incoll, whose evidence was central to the conclusions of the first Hazelwood Mine Fire Inquiry, was referred to the Alcoa response to his recommendations. That document is exhibit 11 in these proceedings.

Mr Incoll said that, "Generally speaking, they (Alcoa) have satisfied the main thrust of my issues." Mr Incoll noted that he was unable to assess certain aspects of Alcoa's response like the TARP because it was not yet available.

What he then said to the inquiry in his evidence is worth quoting in full. Mr Incoll said, "... so I can't know what is in them [that is those documents], but the fact that [Alcoa is] producing something that deals with the issue that I've raised gives me a sense of comfort in that everything else they said they'd do they have done up-to-date, so I assume on that basis that it is going to happen henceforth."

Mr Incoll concluded his valuable contribution to the inquiry with the observation that he would be comfortable that the end result would be satisfactory.

It is my submission that, in light of all of the evidence that it has heard, the board too can have the sense of comfort that Mr Incoll has that Alcoa will deliver on the commitments it has set out in exhibit 11.

In this regard I submit that two particular aspects of the evidence enable the board to have a reasonable expectation that, as Mr Incoll put it, the end result will be satisfactory.

The first aspect of the evidence is that Alcoa's operations at Anglesea are being competently regulated by two relatively well resourced and active government agencies. These agencies, Earth Resources Regulation and the WorkCover Authority, are well aware of the deficiencies in their regulation of the risk of fire at the Hazelwood Mine that were discussed at length in the 2014 Mine Fire Report. The evidence of the officers from those agencies would suggest that the approach that they're taking in the case of Anglesea is a very detailed and thorough one.

Firstly, the Earth Resources Regulation branch has been extensively involved in the closure of the mine since 18 May of this year. That involvement is detailed in the statement of Mr McGowan. Most recently, the branch's senior mining inspector, Mr Mitas, wrote to Mr Rolland of Alcoa, requiring Alcoa to address a number of questions concerning its implementation of the Mining One recommendations. The

2.2

2.8

board heard that Mr Mitas has requested answers to these questions no later than 21 August this year.

Mr Rolland of Alcoa told the inquiry that he will meet with Mr Mitas to discuss that letter on 10 August, that is, next Monday.

The other mine regulator is the VWA, the Victorian WorkCover Authority. Mr Kelly of the VWA explained to the board its role since June 2015 in relation to the imminent closure of the mine. He explained that the role is ongoing and that his staff are meeting with Alcoa on 10 August to discuss the capping strategy, amongst other parts of Alcoa's post closure plans.

In addition, Alcoa, the various agencies and the Emergency Management Commissioner all participate in the Surf Coast Taskforce. The Taskforce and its Latrobe Valley counterpart were established on 16 September last year with the aim of implementing the improvement plans and recommendations detailed in the Hazelwood Mine Fire Inquiry Report, Victorian Government Implementation and Monitoring Plan October 2014 to the Hazelwood Coal Mine Fire Inquiry.

As the chair of that taskforce, Mr Lapsley explained to this inquiry that Alcoa's involvement in the Taskforce has been a very positive experience. At its most recent meeting on 28 May this year, the members of the Taskforce were informed by Alcoa of Alcoa's plans to shut down its mine and power station at Anglesea. Mr Sharp of Alcoa advised of Alcoa's five mitigation plans as described in these submissions.

Mr Lapsley informed this inquiry that at its next meeting the Taskforce would consider the existing Alcoa

2.2

risk assessments and, in Mr Lapsley's words, ensure that everyone's got ownership and understanding, and what are the other risks that need to be considered.

The board therefore, in my submission, can readily assume that the level of regulation and oversight will continue through the month of August and beyond, thus providing the board with a further level of comfort.

The second important aspect of the evidence concerns Alcoa's staffing plans at the mine post closure. In particular, the board has been told that Mr Chris Rolland, the highly experienced mine manager, will remain on the site as the mine rehabilitation supervisor. His role, he told the inquiry, will include supervision of the fire minimisation strategy. He will have an experienced team to support this work. That team is detailed in the evidence.

The Anglesea team will in turn be supported by Mr Sharp, existing site manager, and the health and safety and environmental professionals in Alcoa's asset management and planning group.

Mr Farrington of Mining One was asked if the ongoing involvement of Mr Rolland was beneficial to the oversight of the inspection regime and maintenance issues that he had identified in his report, Mining One report. His response also should be quoted in full.

Mr Farrington told the board, "Based on my exposure to Chris [Rolland] he is very competent, has a very good understanding of the site and its characteristics and I think he would be an ideal person to maintain vigilance on the operation as a whole."

In a similar vein Mr Incoll described Mr Rolland

as "an experienced and competent person", and he said that his appointment would be a "significant bolster for the company's plans". He added that Mr Rolland's appointment would add what Mr Incoll described as "quality assurance".

In summary then, Mr Incoll was asked by the inquiry whether the measures taken and planned to be taken by Alcoa are sustainable, practical and effective to mitigate the risk of fire at the mine. Those words were chosen deliberately, because of course they're the words used in the board's term of reference - sustainable, practical and effective.

In Mr Incoll's report to the board, he outlined Alcoa's action and proposed actions, which I've referred to briefly in these submissions, and he concluded as follows, "From an emergency management viewpoint, these arrangements follow a rational path and appear to be both sustainable and practical. As to their effectiveness, the sole comment is that the contribution an experienced manager makes in an emergency was highlighted by less than effective management when senior managers were not available in the early stages of the Hazelwood Mine Fire. This should be borne in mind when planning incident response at Anglesea."

It's my submission that Alcoa's resourcing plans, and in particular the ongoing role of Mr Rolland, which I've made brief reference to earlier, address this concern of Mr Incoll, as Mr Incoll himself acknowledged in his evidence to the board.

I therefore submit that, for the reasons explained

2.8

above, the board should conclude that Alcoa has either implemented or is in the process of implementing a range of fire minimisation strategies that are effective, practical and sustainable. These strategies when fully implemented should reduce the risk of fire at the Anglesea Mine so far as is reasonably practicable.

It's important to note that the inquiry has not identified any particular options over and above those developed by Alcoa in conjunction with the regulators that the board considers should be implemented at the mine.

The board should be reassured that the regulatory agencies identified above will continue to monitor Alcoa's progress towards fulfillment of the commitments it has made to the board.

I should add that nothing the board concludes or recommends should, in my submission, be taken to limit what Alcoa does or what the various regulatory agencies require Alcoa to do; that is, over and above the commitments in the evidence given to the inquiry.

It is submitted that it would also be desirable if Alcoa updated the Surf Coast Taskforce about its implementation of its fire risk mitigation plans, as is likely to occur at the Taskforce's next meeting in light of the evidence we heard from Mr Lapsley.

It follows then that the only recommendation that I would urge the board to make in relation to this aspect of its terms of reference is to recommend that Alcoa publish on its website a report by 15 September 2015 detailing the steps it has taken

2.2

2.8

1	since 31 July 2015 to implement its fire minimisation
2	strategies as set out in the list of the commitments it
3	provided to the inquiry; that is, exhibit 11.
4	Publication on the Alcoa website will provide important
5	information, both to the community and to regulators.
6	They're the submissions that I would make to the
7	board.
8	CHAIRMAN: Yes, thank you, Mr Rozen. Yes, Mr Attiwill.
9	MR ATTIWILL: Mr Chairman, Mrs Roper, as you know I appear
10	on behalf of the Victorian Government, together with
11	Ms Sion. Mr Rozen has provided a fair and accurate -
12	and has given that submission - all based on the
13	evidence and we don't wish to add anything in relation
14	to those matters.
15	The Victorian Government supports the proposed
16	recommendation that's set out in paragraph 50. The
17	only matter that I'd raise in addition to those
18	matters, Mr Chairman, is, you raised with Mr Rozen this
19	issue of the general fire risk to Anglesea outside of
20	the impact of the closure of the mine. I'd simply say
21	in relation to that, that a convenient source of that
22	general fire risk is in Mr McKenzie's statement at
23	paragraph 19.
24	Mr McKenzie, you will recall, Mr Chairman, is both
25	a senior instructor within the CFA but he is also a
26	local volunteer at Anglesea, and at paragraph 19 he
27	both deals with the fire risk and prescribed burning in
28	short compass, but makes the point

CHAIRMAN: It's only that I think that, in the final report,

there should be reference to that so that anyone

reading the report just understands that there is a

29

30

1	balancing consideration that needs to be borne in mind
2	over this question of fire risk.
3	MR ATTIWILL: Yes, we understand the concern. The only
4	other statement that is relevant to that of course is
5	the statement of Dr Smith, who didn't give oral
6	evidence, but as a deputy secretary he has much to say
7	about prescribed burning and precautions and so forth,
8	and so we will just direct your attention to that as
9	well.
10	CHAIRMAN: Yes. They're incidental references that I think
11	are relatively important but don't directly bear on the
12	issue.
13	MR ATTIWILL: That's correct. They're the submissions on
14	behalf of the Victorian Government, it's a bit longer
15	than I was during the hearing.
16	CHAIRMAN: There are a couple of other factors that mean
17	that the continuing presence of the inquiry is likely
18	to be a factor that will mean it will be kind of
19	exerting a polite pressure indirectly to see that
20	things are done because it has a kind of indirect
21	relevance to matters to do with the short and long-term
22	future of the three mines in the Latrobe Valley.
23	MR ATTIWILL: Yes, and I think, although Mr Rozen has put
24	it, but it was very plain at the end of the two days
25	
_	that Alcoa has made much progress, is prepared to
26	that Alcoa has made much progress, is prepared to listen, and there's been much good cooperation between
26	listen, and there's been much good cooperation between
26 27	listen, and there's been much good cooperation between Alcoa, the local community and the regulators and

31

MR TAYLOR: Thank you, chairman; good morning, Mrs Roper.

1 Once again, I appear for Alcoa Australia.

Before I pass to some more formal remarks that I was going to make and which I'll hand a very brief outline that has been provided to the Bar table, I can update the board, at the risk of giving some evidence from the Bar table, that the contracting crews commenced work on Monday and we've now reached 25 and a half hectares of overburden coverage on the floor of the mine, so the work is progressing at a pace.

There's one matter, and I apologise to Counsel Assisting for not drawing his attention to this because it had got past I and others until this morning. My learned friend suggested that at paragraph 6(c) the moisture content at Anglesea was lower. I think he might have meant to say the moisture content of the coal mine either at Hazelwood was lower; because if one goes to paragraph 28 of Mr Burton's report, the moisture content as received in the samples is 44.7 per cent according to Alcoa's records, and 46.2 according to the Gloe data.

What was higher of course was the megajoules per kilogram of coal, so nothing turns on that as a matter of record.

CHAIRMAN: That needs to be checked, yes.

MR TAYLOR: Just as a matter of record. I can also agree with the amendment to the coverage of the floor that my learned friend made.

The meeting referenced in Counsel Assisting's submissions at paragraph 24(a) on page 7 with the CFA did take place, the minutes are with the CFA for verification and adoption. Other meetings have been

confirmed. That's in particular the one reference to paragraph 34 for 10 August on page 9; that's also been confirmed.

Can I introduce as present today Mr Tim McAuliffe, the gentleman seated to my right in the second row, the Director of Environment Sustainability and Director of Government Relations for Alcoa of Australia.

Mr McAuliffe has come from Perth to be present at today's hearing to hear the submissions; and Mr John Osborne, who was present throughout the evidence last week. Mr Osborne is the Director, Asset Management and Planning Eastern Australia and has come up from Geelong; and of course Mr Sharp, who the board heard from for some time has also come up today.

Other activities are under way, as the board will appreciate, and obviously for that reason Mr Rolland's not present today, he's managing matters.

Could I ask for copies of some brief remarks to be handed to the board. I will speak briefly to these and they won't take long and I don't think they'll even take as long as Mr Attiwill took all of last week.

Can I say first of all that Alcoa has appreciated the opportunity to participate in the inquiry process. It has seen it as an opportunity to be fairly heard, to tell the community and the board what its situation is and what it's doing.

It's had an almost 50-year relationship with the community at Anglesea and is, in my submission, rightly proud of the contribution it's made over the years to the community and the way in which it's managed the mine generally.

Alcoa's decision to close the mine and the power station has not been an easy one; not from an industrial level and certainly not from the human toll level. It's committed to undertaking the site closure and rehabilitation, including the fire risk management, with the same level of diligence that we submit it brought to the operation of the assets throughout its occupation of the site.

We acknowledge the work of Counsel Assisting and the work of the State of Victoria in providing the board with, in our view, a fair, a balanced and a well-informed summary of the history of Alcoa's interactions with the various State agencies in relation to fire risk management.

Alcoa is pleased with the manner in which the hearing was conducted, if we may say so, and we are satisfied that all issues of substance that relate to the terms of reference have been put on the table for consideration by the board. We recognise the comments made by I think Mr Barry and certainly Mr Incoll, that the matters can't be viewed in isolation and the comments of the chair this morning. We hope that the material provided by Alcoa has been of great assistance to the board in determining the issues Alcoa can deal with.

Alcoa's closely reviewed the closing submissions prepared by Counsel Assisting and Alcoa agrees with the summary of the hearing and the key elements of the evidence. We appreciate the recognition of the business's standing as a good corporate citizen and as an organisation that can be trusted to make good on the

2.2

commitments it gives.

2.2

2.8

As the submissions note, a number of issues remain a work-in-progress, but Alcoa is committed to working with relevant agencies to reach a mutually satisfactory resolution to each issue.

Parenthetically I note that Alcoa of course continues to remain a Victorian corporate citizen and continues to have operations in the southwest of the State and will not simply be leaving the jurisdiction come closure of the mine.

The presence of Alcoa's senior management throughout the hearing and again today, in my submission, underlines the seriousness with which Alcoa takes the process.

Alcoa notes the recommendation made by Counsel Assisting that it prepare a report detailing the steps taken since 31 July to implement its fire minimisation strategies and to publish the report on its website by 15 September. Alcoa accepts this recommendation.

In Alcoa's submission, no further recommendations are necessary for the board to be satisfied that the measures Alcoa has committed to will be undertaken.

In that note we understand that one additional submission that we've seen from Environment Victoria has been uploaded and makes some further suggestions with respect to implementation monitor or something of that sort. We would respectfully submit that that is completely unnecessary, and for the reasons that Mr Rozen gave in respect to two well resourced and competent regulatory agencies and the clear evidence given by both Mr Farrington and the evidence given by

Mr Incoll, which not only endorsed what Alcoa had done to date, but also endorsed to a very high standard the opinions and conclusions that were expressed by Mr Farrington. The board might recall Mr Incoll saying that he regarded it as a highly professional and thoroughly well considered report.

For those reasons, we would agree both with the State and with Counsel Assisting that no further recommendations or progress monitoring need be recommended.

Beyond the inquiry process Alcoa will continue to engage with the community through the community consultation network and with the State agencies through the Surf Coast Taskforce and through its ordinary dealings with each agency. Alcoa will use these avenues to provide regular updates about its progress across the range of activities to be performed at Anglesea as the closure transitions into the rehabilitation process.

Alcoa thanks the board for its assistance and its time today. May it please the board, unless there are matters that you want to raise with me, those are the remarks that we make on behalf of Alcoa.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr Taylor. Any matter arising?

MR ROZEN: Just one brief matter to correct an error which is entirely my own. In paragraph 6(c), as Mr Taylor noted, the word "higher" in line 1 should in fact be "lower". For the record, Ms Stansen did point that out to me just before Mr Taylor rose to his feet. That change, I should indicate, will be made before the document is placed on the website.

2.8

1	MR TAYLOR: I hope no one thinks it was a "got you"; it
2	occurred to us at the same time.
3	MR ROZEN: Not at all.
4	CHAIRMAN: Thank you all. We'll now embark upon the process
5	of preparing the report for delivery on its due date.
6	Thank you all.
7	HEARING ADJOURNED
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
29	
30	
31	