



THE BUMPER MONITOR

VOLUME 1 ISSUE NUMBER 9

18TH NOVEMBER 2016

THE UFUA AVIATION BRANCH NEWSLETTER

In this edition:

1. FROM THE SECRETARY
2. UFU: FIREFIGHTER CONTAMINATION REPORT
3. WHAT IS A TASK RESOURCE ANALYSIS [TRA] AND WHY IS IT SO IMPORTANT TO YOU?
4. UFU LESSONS LEARNED 2
5. GETTING THE MESSAGE OUT
6. PURGE BARGAINING TO BOOST APS PRODUCTIVITY: PODGER
7. EA SURVEY NOW OPEN UNTIL 5PM 25TH NOVEMBER
8. FINAL WAGE INCREASE UNDER CURRENT EA

1. FROM THE SECRETARY

Henry Lawrence

I think that you will enjoy this edition of our newsletter. There are some great articles that you will find both interesting and informative. You will also read about the coverage we are getting on the PFOS/PFOA issue following the issue of our "ARFFS Fire Fighter Contamination Report. There is a link in the article on this on our website and I encourage to take the time to read the full report. There will be more on this in later editions of our newsletter. Our report has been widely distributed and as you will see later in this newsletter has generated significant interest in the Adelaide Advertiser with that paper running articles on consecutive days. While our report was only distributed on Tuesday this week we have already had messages of support from federal politicians as well.

I was also able to meet with Stephen Jones, Federal Member for Whitlam in NSW and discussed the DIRD ARFFS Regulatory Review, ACCELERATE program and its affects as well as our concerns about the preparedness of AS/ARFF to take greater and increasing risks with your safety at work and that of the travelling public in the context of rostering arrangements and use of the "remission factor" in Perth and our concern that AS/ARFF will attempt to spread this dangerous arrangement beyond Perth all in the interest of cutting costs.

Enjoy our newsletter and it would be good to get your feedback on our improved communications with you and your stories and photos from a local perspective. So far we haven't been able to include any local stories in our newsletters but they seem to make it into the Monitor. Let us know too what items or information you would like more information on so we can publish it. If you have a question or need more information on a particular issue you can be assure you are not on your own.

I look forward to hearing from you.

2. UFU: FIREFIGHTER CONTAMINATION REPORT

There has been a lot of concern by our UFU members over the possible health effects from their exposure to harmful chemicals for over 30 years. Not just the Per-Fluorinated Chemicals PFC's but also the long history of hot fire training with clean and dirty fuels. The UFU has tried on several occasions to commence a constructive dialogue with Airservices but, so far, to no avail. Airservices/ARFF cling to the line that they are following government policy and advice, advice which we believe is biased and not reflective of the must up to date research and evidence on this issue.

We are not sitting idly by and allowing Airservices. ARFF to continue to ignore the matter and we have continued to be proactive on this matter and commissioned a research report showing clearly what the **real** recognised experts in these matters are saying. The US Environmental Protection Agency, The World Health Organisation, the C8 Science Panel subsidised by 3M themselves, the United Nations Persistent Organic Pollutants review committee, The CFA Fiskville report the Defence Reports, the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry and many other highly regarded scientists and researchers.

This collation of current research includes the original advice provided to Defence in 2003 that was obtained under freedom of information. It shows clearly the potential health issues from the contamination our members have endured. The UFU has sent a copy of this report to Comcare and to Federal Ministers and Senators. We take our obligations to protect your health and safety very seriously and so we have taken this unprecedented action to draw attention to the issues our members are facing and the lack of accountability currently shown by Airservices.

A copy of the UFU Firefighter Contamination report is available to all members on the UFU website.

1 UFU: STRENGTH IN UNITY

3. WHAT IS A TASK RESOURCE ANALYSIS [TRA] AND WHY IS IT SO IMPORTANT TO YOU?

Some of you may have heard or seen in some of our correspondence lately, discussions about conducting a TRA. So what is a TRA? Why is a properly conducted TRA so important for your health and safety and for ensuring that you have a safe system of work when you turn out to a major incident?

Back in 2013 the International Civil Aviation Organisation (ICAO) agreed to adopt a standardised methodology to work out **safe and effective** ARFF crewing levels. They notified all the ICAO member states via a state's letter in 2013 of this recommendation. Most progressive safety focussed ARFF providers have already implemented this process. This is because they value their staff safety and they are focussed on their mission of ensuring that their ARFF services are **highly effective** and provide optimum safety to the passengers they are there to rescue.

Airservices discussed the TRA requirements at a senior manager level and appointed a Chief Supt to prepare for a TRA. He was sent to New Zealand to assist and observe Auckland Airport conduct their TRA. The CFO then presented the TRA recommendation to the previous CEO Airservices at an OCAC meeting. After that the TRA seems to have been buried and in fact the current CFO now pretends not to know what a TRA is whenever the UFU confronts him over this process, or suggests that it will mean less staff than we have now.

There are several documents available for guidance in conducting a TRA. The **ICAO Annexe 14** which is recognised in CASR 139.755 points us to the first of these which is the **ICAO Airport Services Manual Part 1. (ASM Pt 1)** The UK Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) has produced another very detailed guidance document called **CAAP 1150** which provides very detailed steps to guide airports through the TRA process and also sets the tone of **effective** ARFF operations being **the main objective** of the whole process. The National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) NFPA 403 which the UFU recommends all its members read and consider, goes even further by setting minimum staffing limits to all categories and stating that all airports should **never accept less** than that minimum staffing and then conduct a TRA on top of that to justify having more staff.

These documents are also supported by the international experts in the ARFF Working Group (ARFFWG). The ARFFWG has provided a list of agreed timings for operational interventions when conducting a TRA. These are very enlightening and show very clearly how ineffective our current staffing model is. In fact when most of the operational experts here in Australia read those timings their first reaction was "it is just unrealistic and unachievable." That is because we operate with a lot less staff and we apply our norms or beliefs to the situation. In other words we are conditioned to believe that what we have been doing is correct and the norm. When you conduct a real TRA and provide dedicated staffing for these roles and functions it becomes much easier to reach these target times. It also includes acknowledging the human factor consideration of not over-taxing the firefighters so that they become unwell and ineffective from heat and workload stress.

Check the UFU website for links to these documents and take the time to understand why the UFU is so concerned with current unsafe staffing levels. Don't be fooled or bullied into accepting anything less than **safe staffing levels**

4. UFU LESSONS LEARNED NUMBER 2

UFU LESSONS LEARNED

Asiana Flt 214 B777-200

Jul 6, 2013 at 11:27hrs
San Francisco

Crew on board: 16
Pax on board: 291
Total fatalities: 3



Final approach to San Francisco airport, the Aircraft struck a sea wall, 115m short of runway 28L. On impact, empennage was sheared off, aircraft lost both engines and the undercarriage. Aircraft came to rest after 490m on the left side of runway, a severe post-crash fire developed. Two passengers were pronounced dead on scene, 132 others were injured, and 175 people were uninjured. Aircraft was destroyed by impact forces and the post impact fire.

A passenger who was in critical condition died six days later making a total of 3 fatalities.

The NTSB accident report **Findings** contain significant lessons for ARFF providers.

Remember while you read this: In Australia ARFF Category 9 is (2+8) ARFF Category 9 Remission cover is (2+6) ARFF Category 9 is only 3 Foam Trucks with a total of 26,700L.



NTSB FINDINGS OF NOTE TO ARFFS

1. Aircraft rescue and firefighting (ARFF) training for officers placed in command of an aircraft accident.

The arriving incident commander placed an officer in charge of the fire attack who had not received ARFF training, and this individual made decisions that reflected his lack of ARFF training.

Although no additional injuries or loss of life could be attributed to the fire attack supervisor's lack of ARFF training, it demonstrates the potential strategic and tactical challenges associated with having non-ARFF trained personnel in positions of command at an airplane accident.

2. Guidance on when to pierce the fuselage of a burning airplane with a skin-piercing nozzle.

The airport's fire department had two vehicles equipped with high-reach extendable turrets (HRETs) that were not used to the best of their capabilities in the initial attack.

This was partially the result of departmental guidance that discouraged penetration of the fuselage using the skin-piercing nozzles on the HRETs until all of the occupants were known to have evacuated the airplane.

Current FAA guidance provides information on how to pierce but does not include any guidance on when to pierce.

3. Integration of the medical supply buses at SFO into the airport's preparation drills.

Although the airport's emergency procedures manual called for airport operations personnel to deliver the airport's two emergency medical buses to the accident site, neither of the medical buses arrived. Further, the monthly emergency drills conducted by the airport did not include deployment of the buses either as a matter of routine or as part of the unique scenario being evaluated.

This lack of integration of the medical buses into the airport's preparation drills likely played a part in their lack of use in the initial response to the accident.

4. Guidance or protocols for ensuring the safety of passengers and crew at risk of being struck or rolled over by a vehicle during ARFF operations.

In this case, only one passenger was at significant risk for a vehicle strike due to her close proximity to the burning airplane; however, there are other accident scenarios in which many injured or deceased persons could be located near an accident airplane.

There is currently no guidance or any recommended protocols for ensuring the safety of passengers and crew at risk of being struck or rolled over by a vehicle during ARFF operations.

5. Requirements for ARFF staffing.

Seven ARFF vehicles and 23 ARFF personnel from SFO's airport fire department were involved in the initial response to the accident.

This equipment level exceeded the FAA-required minimum of three vehicles, and there is currently no FAA-required minimum staffing level.

Because of the amount of available ARFF vehicles and personnel, the airport firefighters were able to perform exterior firefighting and send firefighters into the airplane who rescued five passengers that were unable to self-evacuate amid rapidly deteriorating cabin conditions.

Due to the lack of an FAA-required minimum staffing level, passengers involved in an aviation accident at a smaller airport may not be afforded the same level of protection that the passengers of flight 214 had. Remember: Australia uses cat 9 remission (2+6) Darwin, Cairns and Coolangatta Cat 8



So what do UFU Members learn from this:

1. Firstly most of you would remember that when this accident occurred our CFO released an SOP on walking through foam blankets so ARFFS vehicles do not run over casualties hidden by foam. This was based on this accident report and the NTSB findings. What happened to the other NTSB findings?

2. So when questioned about how does ARFF maintain Command and Control of the combat area of a B-777 or B-747 crash at Cairns, Darwin, or Coolangatta with only two officers some of you may have heard our senior managers state they would have to rely on the arriving services? Wouldn't that be even worse than relying on an Urban Fire Officer from a combined department/airport service with no ARFF training?
3. One that would be dear to Brisbane Members hearts, how often do you include the QFES Aerial in your regular training? How many current Brisbane members have actually gone up in the QFES Aerial basket with a charged hose and a CABA on? Ever tried to open an aircraft door from the basket? You know where the emergency stops are or if they even have one? Do you know how to get down again if the pedestal operator gets incapacitated or leaves?
4. HRET how many incidents do you see these days where HRET is the only way they can control the internal fires and make rescue operations safe? Why doesn't ARFF in Australia have any defensive operations at all for aviation? Can you punch out the plug type windows with a sledge hammer like the FAA teach? Those three FD20 fire drills all live in the back sheds at Melbourne, Brisbane and Cairns. Melbourne even has an old trial manual driven spike type branch that sits up in the FCC storeroom. The FVR5 project was supposed to address some of these concerns but was scrapped because passengers and our firefighters' safety is just too expensive for Airservices.
5. Three ARFF stations here in Australia are expected to respond a job like this with 2+6 and only three trucks (Remission).
6. Australia provides no HRET's at all, and no Q3 agent to maintain internal firefighting operations.
7. ARFF Management want you to let a Police Sargent or Brigade SO run this incident from the FCP with no communications plan or link to the FCP until the ARFF Ops Manager shows up, if they are even available. (90min response times, up to 12 days with no replacement)
8. This incident clearly shows that if you do a proper TRA and have justified staffing levels you can make rapid internal entry and save 5 people's lives or even more.
9. Here in Australia those 5 people would have died as 2+6 simply won't allow for an effective and safe ARFF intervention.
10. It is paramount that the safety message the UFU is trying to communicate to government is acknowledged and acted on before a crash like this occurs at one of our under resourced airports and our members are injured or killed trying do the impossible with insufficient equipment, agent, staffing and vehicles.

Don't miss out on our newsletters and other information and communications with members. Make sure we have your current and correct postal and email addresses and your correct banking details for payment of your subscriptions. Remember, only financial members can take advantage of the services offered by
Your Union.

5. GETTING THE MESSAGE OUT



Branch Secretary with Stephen Jones
MHR Member for Whitlam and CPSU
National Organiser for Airservices
Danielle Mutton

It is important that your Union takes every opportunity we can to get our message out there to and through the people who have the potential to make a difference. On Monday 14th November Branch Secretary did just that when he was invited to meet with the Federal Member for Whitlam, Stephen Jones MHR. Stephen is a former National Secretary of the CPSU and is currently the Shadow Minister for Regional Services, Territories and Local Government.

Together with our comrade Danielle Mutton from the CPSU, Branch Secretary Henry Lawrence discussed the restructuring of Airservices under the ACCELERATE program, the DIRD ARFFS Regulatory Review and its potential to reduce existing ARFFS services around Australia as well as capping ARFFS provision at its currently worst in the world levels, possible outsourcing of the work done by our comrade EVT,

how ARFF are irresponsibly expanding the risk they are prepared to take in providing ARFFS at airports citing the recently imposed reduced coverage at Perth airport and the potential for ARFF to attempt to spread this dangerous arrangement beyond Perth.

Your Union is continuing its efforts to have Airservices accept responsibility for exposing many of you to PFOS/PFOA and potentially continuing to expose you as reported in the Adelaide Advertiser article below. A copy of our "ARFF Fire Fighters Contamination Report" was sent to the Advertiser journalist who published the below articles.



Toxins in donor blood 'risky'

ELIZABETH HENSON

CHEMICAL experts say blood banks should stop accepting donated blood containing high levels of the potentially deadly chemicals at the centre of the Australian Defence Force contamination crisis.

However, the Red Cross Blood Service spokeswoman Rebecca DiGirolamo insists there is "no evidence" to suggest donations with large amounts of perfluorooctane sulfonate (PFOS) and perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA) pose

a risk to recipients. But contamination experts disagree and are urging blood banks to immediately cease using donations containing high levels of the toxins.

The warning came after Adelaide man Geoff Fuller, who had a 36-year career as a firefighter at airports including Adelaide Airport, was informed by the blood service last week that he was no longer allowed to donate blood.

Mr Fuller, a regular donor, said he was told so after tests revealed he had high levels of

Chemicals 'put lives at risk'

The Advertiser, yesterday,

PFOS and PFOA - part of the per-fluoroalkyl and poly-fluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) group of toxins - in his system.

However, two days later Mr Fuller, of Underdale, was contacted by the service and told staff at the blood bank had overreacted and would resume accepting his blood.

PFOS and PFOA, which have contaminated more than

a dozen army, navy and air force bases, including the Edinburgh RAAF base, have been linked to cancer in people and animals in numerous studies across the world.

The toxins, which do not break down in the environment, were used in firefighting foam at defence bases and airports until the early 2000s.

Professor Ravi Naidu, from independent contamination research and assessment organisation CRC Care, was adamant blood banks should not accept donations from people

with high levels of PFOS and PFOA in their system.

He warned there was "significant risk" associated with transfusing blood contaminated with the toxins.

"Donations from people who have been exposed to PFAS and who demonstrate presence of PHAS must not be accepted," Professor Naidu said.

Dr Marianna Lloyd-Smith, from the National Toxics Network, agreed blood donations should not be accepted from people who have been exposed

to high levels of PFOS and PFOA.

"They have significantly higher levels and you really wouldn't want them to be giving blood," she said.

"I would suggest that they speak to their blood donation officers and tell them. I (also) think the blood banks need to be proactive and ask people."

Blood testing of some aviation firefighters has found their levels of PFOS and PFOA to be up to 15 times higher than what is found in the average Australian.

And this message of support from the Greens after receiving our "ARFF Fire Fighters Contamination Report".

Dear Henry and UFU,

Thanks for sending your report through. After over a year of work on this issue, including initiating a Senate inquiry into contamination on sites around the country, we remain deeply concerned about the lack of government support being offered to current and former workers who have come into contact with these toxic foams. We believe this is a workplace safety issue as much as it is a public health and environmental issue.

The Defence Department, RAAF and federal government knew of the hazards associated with PFAS chemicals before the scandal erupted, and their failure to act exposes their deep disdain for workers and communities.

We have asked the Department of Defence and the government a number of times what sort of support they are providing to workers, past and present, who would have come into contact with these foams on their watch. We have never received a decent answer.

Back in May the AMWU joined our calls for voluntary and free blood testing for as many current and former staff as possible. Health testing should be periodic, and all affected workers should be properly briefed and supported. The ongoing WHS concerns are valid and we will continue to demand answers from Defence and the Government.

Lee Rhiannon
Greens Senator for NSW

6. PURGE BARGAINING TO BOOST APS PRODUCTIVITY: PODGER

Workplace Express, Tuesday, November 15, 2016, 3:17pm

Former Public Service Commissioner Andrew Podger has told a Senate inquiry that getting rid of bargaining altogether in the federal public sector would improve productivity.

Education and Employment References Committee chair Senator Gavin Marshall asked Podger at a hearing in Canberra on Friday whether "getting rid of bargaining itself might in itself be an improvement in productivity".

"Absolutely", the former commissioner replied.

In answer to an earlier question, Podger, who served as APS Commissioner for two years between 2002 and 2004, said "a centralised arrangement [for determining pay and conditions] would be a lot more efficient and be, in itself, a productivity gain".

He said staff and management in every APS agency participated in an "extraordinary ongoing running-around" over long periods trying to identify productivity gains, but were "frankly wasting an awful lot of the services' resources" that "could be better handled".

Podger told the committee's inquiry into the Government's workplace bargaining policy and its approach to Commonwealth public sector bargaining there is "no doubt" the Government is justified in the current budgetary circumstances in seeking wage restraint in the APS and broader federal public sector and in seeking to constrain departmental expenses including for public servants' pay and conditions. But the Government's bargaining policy is on the wrong track, he said.

"My central concern is that the mechanism being applied to restrain wages and total remuneration and to limit running cost budgets is not appropriate and has not been appropriate for some time.

"This has caused very serious damage to the integrity of the whole pay system in the public service, with tangible impact on mobility within the service, serious management problems for agencies affected by machinery of government changes, justified complaints of unfairness across and within agencies, and unknown impacts on attraction and retention of the skills the APS requires", he said.

"This has caused very serious damage to the integrity of the whole pay system in the public service," he said. Podger said the reduction in mobility driven by the bargaining policy caused serious management problems for agencies, particularly those affected by machinery of government changes.

He said the requirement for pay increases to be fully offset by productivity improvements in each agency is inconsistent "with the way productivity translates into labour market outcomes, including rates of pay, whether in the public or private sector.

"The dangers of pressing this approach in the public sector are doubly serious", he said.

As a central rule of the existing policy framework, each agency must find productivity offsets within their agency.

"Some agencies can find it and some cannot. And, of course, the amount of money available in each agency is a political process," he said.

Podger said setting pay based on individual enterprise productivity is inappropriate because agency budgets are determined by the political process, not by the market.

He said that while there might have been a case for adopting this approach for the short-term in the 1990s, it was never a "sensible long-term strategy."

"This issue of devolving pay and classifications, which began in the early 1990s, was taken a lot further in the late 1990s and I think was a step way too far.

"I think a lot of the devolution of the '80s and '90s was extremely beneficial, letting — or making — the managers manage, but in this area I think it was a mistake and I do not know of any other country that has gone quite as far as we have on pay and conditions," he said.

Centralised approach would be better

Podger said the Government's policy could be improved with a greater emphasis on an APS-wide approach. This would involve undertaking market surveys of pay and conditions for comparable work, reviewing data on the APS experience in attraction and retention and explaining in better detail the changing demands for particular skill sets.

He continued that "a firm cap could still be set on the average APS-wide pay increase with some differentiated distribution to address the more acute variations".

He said a market survey approach would also provide a solid basis on which to "challenge the union's ambit bids".

"I would be very surprised if the more APS-wide approach I am advocating would not in itself deliver significant productivity gains, reducing enormously the workload on management across the APS that has been devoted to this frustrating and largely counterproductive process," he told the inquiry.

7. EA SURVEY NOW OPEN UNTIL 25TH NOVEMBER

Our EA survey was due to close at 5PM tomorrow 18th November but will now remain open until 5PM Friday 25th November. Make sure you complete the survey and give us your input to our next round of bargaining.

8. FINAL WAGE INCREASE UNDER 2013-2017 EA

Your final wage increase under the current EA will be paid from the first pay period on or after 22nd November. As your subscriptions are tied to your wage increases, subscriptions will increase by a small amount as well from that same period.