

From: Colin Durrell <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, 18 December 2019 9:17 PM
To: DJCS-CAV-Communications (DJCS) <cav.communications@justice.vic.gov.au>
Subject: I note your advice that input has stopped.

Dear CAV,

Much as input has ceased; I believe from what I have heard & read you are not proposing a well costed and tested conclusion.

My [REDACTED] is a Real Estate agent in Colorado USA & there - Carbon Monoxide problems are well recognized.

And what comes clear with respect to Victoria's Consumer Affairs approach is that there are differences NOT being addressed appropriately, (i.e. as far as I have read re Victoria's plan).

I believe Victoria can have a cost effective, & be much more safety assuring - better than the USA ; & better than what I have read to date.

We in Victoria have had a close go with Ducted Heating . i.e. children playing where the warmth enters the rooms through floor vents.

My points will be:

- * 1. The cost effectiveness of your two year visit is not yet ideal.
- * 2. The two yearly visit does not safety-address adequately - it is too spaced to be bullet proof.
- * Immediacy is necessary for diligence & the alarm/s to function.

* The differences between USA & Victoria (and States further north) are worth consideration.

Heating in the Colorado area is generally by furnace.

i.e. Oil &/or gas fired furnaces .

Their warmth is projected into ducted systems.

Such furnaces can produce C.O..

The necessary sensor/s positions are prescribed by drawing an outlines of the ducting within a two story building . i.e. the recommendation is for positioning of many C.O., sensors - for appropriate function.

Compare Cooling : it is generally provided by electrical energy. And generally distributed by overhead ducts.

* C.O. detection is not required.

Failure of a furnace is likely to occur between winter seasons?

Would a two year check be OK ? - probably - if it occurs just before the start of winter or at switch on.

A more cost and effective check can be by prescribing & marketing 10 year life guaranteed C.O., & smoke sensors.

9 year checks are a probable optimum? Compared with 2 yearly checks. Access has to be considered & for a working family & how would you get in cost effectively? Weekend work?

The numbers of sensor for ducting might be able to be reduced to One.

The two year checking of Melbourne is not the best choice.

You can build more on my ideas but for me I am concerned that I see no evidence that your scheme is - well : "a life saving one".

I'd appreciate an acknowledgement of my email.

Thanking you

Colin Durrell