

Ref Application number SSD21184278

“Woodlawn Advanced Energy Recovery Centre”

I, Kathleen Mary Patricia Anne Wiggan completely object to the Veolia proposal to add a “Waste Incinerator” to their Tarago operations. I live in Bungonia 33 King st 2580 only a few Kilometres away from Tarago and in the heart of a population boom and small farm district of wonderful diversity .This proposal will add immeasurably to the current misery of Tarago population as Veolia is notorious in the community for its continuing lack of Compliance within its current operations. There is absolutely no reason sufficient to add a supposedly technologically sensitive process to this operation which fails, even now , to keep local people ,their livestock and the landscape safe .

It is crazy to consider that a waste burner in Sydney was so dangerous it could not be countenanced YET it is fine to put into Tarago. In Bungonia we were faced with the same ridiculous thinking and that incinerator proposal ,much to the relief of all, was also considered too dangerous to install or place in just such a rural location.

It is time to say this technology is an out of date and cost prohibitive response to our waste management . It is NOT re-cycling ; it is only destruction. Not only is it hugely expensive and carbon costly to set up ,transport also adds carbon costs ,the fly ash remains as carbon cost as does the toxic solid waste which is so toxic it must be buried in concrete(more carbon cost) or glass(more carbon cost) and transported off site (another carbon cost in hazard materials trucks) to a secure site somewhere else in the state . Incinerators with their constant pollution and operational compliance fails in Europe USA and UK are all being phased out. The reasons include:-

A/Much better and actual re-cycling of the embedded resource materials mean that as the new processes are more cost effective, less polluting, increase the varied uses to which the recovered materials can be put -there is an increasing number and variety of sustainable industries able to be developed from this approach.

B/The increasing scientific evidence for clusters of chronic health problems in People, births, livestock ,insect populations and waterways in any proximity to the constant plumes of toxic gases. The burning process itself contributes to climate change by adding \$140,000 tonnes of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gasses to the atmosphere each year.All this goes into the wind plume which deposits over the surrounding landscape ; the rooftop water collection , the livestock water dams , the creeks supplying city water Queanbeyan and Canberra. Why is this ok ???

C/ independent Air quality MONITORS SHOWING THE INNACCURACIES AND COVERUPS OF THE MULTI-NATIONAL OPERATORS WHO ALLOW /TOLERATE OR IGNORE COMPLIANCE ISSUES AS AWARENESS AND ACTION DOES NOT BENEFIT THE BUSINESS economics .

C/soil analyses showing Furans Dioxins PCBs .PAHs and other permanent carcinogens which remain in the biomass and in the soil profiles for hundreds to thousands of years as danger to all life forms. They are cumulative contaminants ,irreducible , and remain carcinogenic all that time .

D/ new methods and approaches [see Scientia Professor Veena Sahajwalla - UNSW Research pioneering work] free modern forward thinking businesses to explore more sustainable and cost effective carbon saving solutions.

E/ if the amount of \$600 mill was put to making Australians as effective and assiduous at re-cycling as Japan and slowly the European and UK and Us populations we would generate not toxic waste and permanent carcinogens ,but generate multiple new innovative circle industries to save and rework the resources. The re-cycling policies of overseas countries is a death knell to the wasteful incineration of “waste” which should rather be called a “Resource Destruction” process.

F/ The “modelling “ done as the basis of the EIS suffers from the same flaws as any self-serving paid report will characterise;

1/the data was taken over the COVID period of years thus ensuring that huge positives wrongfully can be attributed to the proponent business. The data is flawed because it is not Realistic situations; Where does it take into account the now regular climate change effects of 90-11kmp hour winds in this area as the Tarago Wind farm attests.

2/Where has genuine study gone into the demographic changes in the surrounding districts.?

3/ a Human Health Risk Assessment that states basically that they don't take responsibility for inaccuracies means that these paid specialists have provided what was needed by the company possibly from the company material but they are basing their conclusions on an insupportable risk analysis. The Precautionary Principle says that if you DON'T know how dangerous or risky something is – you proceed as if it is the worst case scenario and rate it as both dangerous and risky and then you make your decision. So ,to preface their report with “all care- no responsibility” (to paraphrase) is to throw our local populations , diversity landscapes and livestock all under the Veolia toxic train wheels

Concrete is no solution

The solution of containing the most toxic of all waste products [those actually CREATED by the incineration process which fused all the varied toxins into a lethal mix] in concrete requires serious revision . CONCRETE is by nature PORUS . However it is stored it will de-nature over time - creating a “TIME-BOMB” of leachates for the future! Glass- as in something akin to obsidian might be some solution , but the best and safest solution is ,of course, not to create this nightmare product at all .

Treating the rural populations as less valuable and important than their city fellows is reprehensible and betrayal of the Governments DUTY OF CARE towards all its citizens ,and in direct contravention of the UNO Human Rights Charter[which Australia has had neither the foresight, nor the governmental calibre, to adopt]

There will be negative impacts on the Glossy Black Cockatoo habitat range in the Tarago, Quialigo, Windellema, Bungonia Glossy Black Corridor areas as identified by the Citizen Science records; The Glossy Blacks are identified as a significant Endangered Species found along the Eastern Dividing Range .Thought to only extend in range to Penrose, now, however ,we have consistent reports which show significant clusters of Glossy Black family groups using remnant Allocasurina native stands as well as specifically planted groves [part of the Save the Glossy Blacks project] These food resources are crucial for the Species to survive EXTINCTION. The plantings enable the birds both to survive and to chose a migration into a more favourable environment as Climate Change impacts their habitat. The damage and pollution of these scarce food resources for this highly significant Endanged Species will ensure that their chances of survival will be predictably compromised.

So, Locals don't want it ; surrounding communities dont want it, Bungonia didn't want it , SYDNEY didn't want it ; There are NO Veolia Principals to my knowledge who are agreeing to bring their families to live permanently in the plume and waste outflow of toxic chemicals -so they are probably also against it at the level of caring for their OWN family .There is no justification to put it in any jurisdiction where there is no positive community support.

If the argument is that the Tarago community is already damaged by toxic waste and more wont matter !!!!! that is cruel and indefensible position to take .

Please do not allow this proposal to be approved.

NSW should , like ACT ,BAN this kind of short sighted and damaging proposal from the State.

I have NOT made any political donations.

I acknowledge and accept the Departments disclaimer and declaration.

Sincerely

Anne Wiggan

"MIZPAH" 33 King St .Bungonia 2580

(02) 4844 4228