

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, 6 December 2022 10:54 AM
To: DPE PS Industry Assessments Mailbox
Subject: Objection to Woodlawn ARC (SSD-21184278)

Submission : Objection to Woodlawn ARC (SSD-21184278)

Details and disclaimers:

Name and Address:

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

(Happy to disclose my name, and make my submission public, please keep my street address private).

I am lodging an objection and I have not made any political donations at all, ever.

I accept the Department's disclaimer and declaration.

Objection to Woodlawn ARC (SSD-21184278)

I strongly object to Veolias proposed incinerator being built in Tarago, or indeed being built anywhere at all. I am concerned about the precedent this proposal sets, its carbon intensive nature, and its negative health effects. Also its negative environmental and economic effects on surrounding areas, individuals personal health, the resulting impact on the public health system, and the environment.

It is not necessary to incinerate our waste at all. We should be striving to reduce the production of waste, but in the event that we do not achieve significant reduction, there is still sufficient capacity in terms of landfill at Woodlawn to hold our waste for at least 25 years. If waste reduction and circular economy measures increase, Woodlawn landfill will be able to take our landfill waste well into the future. It is not necessary to create this dirty energy generating system to reduce our waste volume, nor is it necessary for energy generation purposes - there are greener, cleaner methods available which do not belch polluting gases, particulates, heavy metals, persistent organic particulates and dioxins. These other methods of energy production also do not produce millions of tonnes of potentially toxic (hazardous) waste ash. All of these do not need to be produced and released to the air, land and water, potentially contaminating our food chain. These wastes and emissions should not be produced at all - they are not acceptable, in any concentration. The waste stream is safer for the public left unburnt in landfill, whilst we work on reducing the production of waste going forward.

Incinerators are more polluting during start up, shut down and other non-standard operating conditions - this is not acceptable. Veolia often exceeds such thresholds in its incinerators overseas, and this company has a history of poor compliance with their licence conditions locally at Woodlawn. This company does not have a social licence to operate - we do not accept any reported benefits (economic, employment or otherwise) are sufficient to offset the long term damage this proposal will create in terms of the environment and public health.

The European Union is moving away from such installations, we have to explore the reasons why. It cannot be because the entire European continent are "NIMBYs". Community objections are, in fact, objecting to it in any region at all, due to unacceptable impacts. It also will transfer the impacts on to other younger generations, going against the principles of intergenerational equity. Have we not burdened the younger and future generations enough with our impacts already?! There is no safe pollution threshold for some of the emissions of this proposed facility. There are also risks that it will contaminate our food chain and thus its impact could be spread even wider than expected, due to our modern world where produce is shipped long distances.

The incinerator entrenches a wasteful economy at a time when we need a circular one. Waste incineration will require feedstock for 25+ years. In Europe they have had to import waste to keep their incinerators 'fed'. It is not a viable industry for Australia, for this current point in our transformation to prevent further climate effects. It does not consider where we will be in 20 years time, when the facility will still be operating. The proposal to burn up to 380,000 Tonnes per year of household and commercial waste for the next 25 years is not a proposal for 2022 and beyond. It must not be supported.

If the government chooses to approve this, against my wishes, then emissions targets must be brought into line with Europe, and the company should be put on notice that emissions targets will be further tightened progressively over the life of the facility. We cannot sign up to a toxic pollution generating technology such as this and burden future generations with the impact. I strongly object to this proposal in any form. I also strongly object to the fact that Australias emission regulations are weaker than worlds best practice.

DO NOT APPROVE THIS DEVELOPMENT!