

Kirra Vanzetti

From: Raymond Rowe [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, 6 July 2017 7:59 PM
To: LCSC
Subject: Fwd: Fire Services Bill Submission

Sent from my Samsung Galaxy Tab S on the Telstra Mobile Network

----- Original message -----

From: [REDACTED]
Date: 6/07/2017 08:05 (GMT+10:00)
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Fwd: Fire Services Bill Submission

Get [Outlook for Android](#)

Subject: Fwd: Fire Services Bill Submission

Dear Fire Services Bill Select Committee,

I am writing to ask you to consider the negative implications of the proposed Fire Services Bill as I see them.

1. This Bill has been rushed through seemingly to appease the UFU. It would also appear that the UFU were involved in the development of this Bill as surprisingly, the UFU had their television and other media advertising ready to roll out the very day the proposed changes were announced.

2. Members of the CFA (or their representatives) have NOT been consulted as per the Volunteer Charter.

CFA Brigades and Members need to be consulted.

3. The people of Victoria and in particular members of the CFA have been given NO voice in the proposed Bill.

The people of Victoria and in particular members of the CFA have to be given a voice

4. Very few details of the proposed Bill have been revealed and no one can say how the change is really going

to affect the running/operations of CFA.

My belief is that many details are unknown and the Government will simply "Wing It" as the Bill rolls out.

Full details have to be revealed so everyone knows how the changes will affect the running/operations of CFA.

5. Operations Managers/Officers and Trainers being seconded to CFA could mean that CFA will end up with Operations Managers/Officers and Trainers who are former MFB staff and are not familiar with how CFA operates or dealing with the volunteer culture (very different to MFB culture).

All Operations Managers/Officers and Trainers should have a CFA background. Not be a part of the VFS. The loyalty will not be to the CFA

6. Whilst being highly trained in Structure incidents, Former MFB staff DO NOT and WILL NOT have the level of Training and Experience in WILDFIRE as their CFA Trained counterparts. This would lower the standard of Wildfire training currently experienced by CFA Volunteers and would put more Victorian lives and properties at risk.

All Trainers for CFA should have a CFA background. EVEN if that means suitably qualified and experienced Volunteers being promoted into those roles.

7. Volunteers from Integrated stations: WILL be pushed out of their brigades as STAFF will not work with volunteers (Especially former MFB staff). Which will ultimately cause large numbers of volunteers to leave CFA thus further reducing the surge capacity.

8. The impact of FRV stations on neighbouring brigades: Volunteer brigades who neighbour FRV stations will have FRV staff responding to their local brigade area (Currently happening with Integrated Brigades) and running local jobs which are currently run by local brigade members, this will irreparably damage the sense of worth of CFA volunteers – devaluing service and commitment.

9. The proposed **Presumptive legislation discriminates against volunteers**, and should NOT be attached to the proposed changes.

10. The claim of 8 reviews as creating a need for change: Outcomes of the "REVIEWS" revealed the current Integrated model works efficiently and New Zealand has just recently adopted the same model as CFA currently use.

11. What is this all REALLY going to cost? Not only in Dollar value but in the Health and wellbeing of ALL Victorian Firefighters and ALL Victorians.

Please take the above into consideration when making your decision.

Kind regards



