

Draft Work Health and Safety (Mines) Regulation

Public comment template

Please send submissions by email to <u>consult.minesafety@trade.nsw.gov.au</u> Submissions must be received by 27 June 2014.					
Confidentiality: Any information that you do not wish to be made available to the public should be clearly marked 'IN CONFIDENCE'. Submissions are subject to all relevant laws such as the Government Information (Public Access) Act 2009 and the Privacy and Personal Information Protection Act 1998. NSW Trade & Investment may provide extracts of submissions to other stakeholders for comment during the review of public submissions. Please indicate here by a tick I if this submission or any parts of it are provided in confidence.					
Whole submission Address and contact details Part (please specify) Image: Part (please specify) 					
Name: H Wytl	nes & D Brookman	Organisation (if applicable): Cobar Management Pty Ltd		
 This template is divided into two parts: 1. Comments in response to discussion paper 2. Comments in relation to draft regulation Please ensure you include the page, section number or regulation clause number to which your comment relates. Your submission should, wherever possible, include evidence and examples to justify your position. 					
Part 1 - Comments in response to discussion paper					
Page or Section No.	Discussion point and your comment				



Part 2 - Comments in relation to draft regulation				
Clause number	Title of clause and your comment or suggestion			
Page 187 Schedule 10 6 (6)	We suggest that the title is amended to include a reference to 'high voltage' as per cl. 67 in MHSR 2007.			
Page 187 Schedule 10 6 (6) (a)	We suggest 'Design & Review' be amended to 'Control and Manage' to bring it into line with the rest of the regulation.			
Page 33 27 (a)	We require clarification on whether 'written' refers to 'hand written' or whether a computer-generated report would satisfy. We suggest that hand written is impractical.			
Page 34 29 2 (d) (i)	We strongly suggest that eight hourly conveyor belt checks be extended to twelve hourly. We require clarification on what constitutes a 'competent person', and what records or checks need are required to be undertaken to meet this competency.			
Page 37 33 2 (b) (ii)	We require clarification on whether this notification is required prior to energisation (impractical), or whether notification can follow energisation with adequate monitoring and control by the Electrical Manager or Engineer.			
Page 38 33 2 (h)	Currently, (i) earth fault lockout is not required on surface installations, only (ii) earth continuity (pilot earths). Major expenditure would be required to bring existing infrastructure to compliance with the proposed regulations. We have no recorded instances of cable faults where the pilot has been affected and allowed the cable to become energised to create a hazardous situation.			
Page 38 33 2 (I)	The current regulation mentions poly phase systems. This should only be a requirement on single phase systems greater than 25Kva. This would allow for standardisation as currently exists for domestic, commercial and underground situations and promote familiarity for our electrical personnel. If this clause comes into force, we suggest that most metalliferous mines and quarries will not be compliant as all secondary neutrals will require a NER (IT earthing), for example, the typical types of installations are for general light and power to supply crib rooms, offices and workshops. The earth fault magnitude is limited by the size of the single phase isolation transformer.			



Page 39 33 2 (o)	In reference to sub circuits, we require clarification on whether this is covered by upstream earth leakage devices. Some final sub circuits may not have earth leakage protection (sensitive earth fault) due to the type of load, for example, heating elements and welders. This is not practical on DC circuits and unnecessary on ELV circuits.
Page 158 Schedule 3 Part 1 3 (2)	The defined waiting period is neither practical nor achievable. Every effort is taken to ensure all energy sources are isolated before any electrical work is undertaken. We suggest a process of pre-approval to allow breakdown activities on legacy type equipment, provided appropriate safeguards are in place. These safeguards may include formal and informal risk assessments for each activity. We suggest what also must be kept in mind is that we are a 24 hour operation, and the closest Mines Inspector is based some 500kms from our site and not available around the clock.
Page 95 101(a) & (b)	We support (a) - that there be at least one person at the surface readily available to be contacted by persons underground. However, we do not support (b) - that each such person would also be competent 'to restore the supply of power to the underground parts of the mine'. Most emergency first responders, who are readily available to be contacted by persons underground, are non-electrical personnel. Conversely, most electrical personnel are not readily available to be contacted by persons underground. To have this competence determined by two such discrete functions is not, we suggest, practical. We do not have a night shift electrician on the surface, though we do have on call personnel available to attend site within 30 minutes. Our ESO's have access to electrical emergency plan locations of critical infrastructure, but as stated we would not permit non- electrical personnel to restore power.
Page 107 121 4 (c)	We suggest that the location of electrical installations should reference high voltage installations only.