

Submission Number: 226.1
Date Received: 23/9/2012



Supplementary to Submission (226)

House of Representatives Standing Committee on Regional Australia

Inquiry into the use of FIFO workforce practices in Regional Australia

From Matthew Ford

I would like to point out that there are significant differences between the Exploration, Construction, and Production phases of a mining operation, in both numbers of employee's and the employee's housing and or accomodation requirements.

For example the exploration workers generally drive in with their rigs and support vehicles and camp 'out bush' or make use of any local accomodation and drive out to the rig & back in a service vehicle.

Statistical figures of the overall numbers of FIFO/DIDO workers may be even more usefull if the above groups are looked at separately for the purposes of analysing the positive and negative effects on them, their families and the regions they are employed in.

Ignoring the absurd proposition mines are constantly shutting down shortly after commissioning, production phase employee's are the most permanent on site of the three groups. Therefore they could be seen to be the most likely to be interested in taking up local housing options. However many workers from the other two groups also get interested in production roles. They will have interchangeable skill sets and could also be candidates for local housing, particularly if they have grown to like the area and it would suit their's or their families situation.

Finally I would like to add that constructing a housing estate in a nearby town, at about the same time a mines construction phase is under way, is not exactly putting man on the moon. Transportable homes, which can be left permanently in place, a good option. Virtually the same technology employed by companies currently building and installing 'dongas'.

Kind Regards
Matthew Ford