

## **OBJECTION / Woodlawn ARC: SSD-21184278**

### **I object**

**I do not want my name, address, email, phone number or any other identifying information to be published or made available.**

In addition to the numbered reasons below, I wish to say that it is incomprehensible to me that Toxic WtE Incineration is being considered anywhere, let alone in our beautiful, clean regional areas where people still collect their drinking water from their roofs, where our food is grown and where there are many organic farms. What are you thinking? Obviously, you weren't, but hopefully now you will.

**Objection Reason #1** This industry is being rejected all over the rest of the world by countries who have had many generations of experience with it. They have learnt from experience, we don't need to make their mistakes to learn how bad this is for our country now that their money making and environmental destroying opportunities have dried up elsewhere.

**Objection reason #2** What are we NOT being told? Tanya Davies (NSW MP) announced in a media release that there would be NO incinerators in the Sydney Basin, yet Sydney proposals as well as the "precinct" proposals continue to be appealed and submitted. Why would that be if WtE wasn't going to end up everywhere in NSW once it is approved regionally?

**Objection reason #3** Waste to Energy Incinerators pose a SIGNIFICANT THREAT TO PUBLIC HEALTH and the ENVIRONMENT!!!

**Objection reason #4** Waste Incineration is the Most Expensive Way to Manage Waste!

**Objection reason #5** Burning waste is the DIRTIEST form of energy generation, DIRTIER THAN COAL!

**Objection reason #6** Waste Incineration is the Most Expensive Way to Manage Waste!

**Objection reason #7** High dioxin levels in eggs of backyard chickens, the vegetation of evergreen trees, and mosses in the vicinity of the incinerators! Imagine what it is doing to your body!

**Objection reason #8** Burning garbage to generate power is NEITHER clean nor renewable!

**Objection reason #9** Incinerators provide a classic case of environmental injustice.

**Objection reason #10** WtE Incinerator contracts are 25-30 years, that's a LONG time to live with a LIFE-THREATENING decision.

**Objection reason #11** WtE Incinerators produce hazardous air pollutants including particulate matter (PM2.5 and PM10), carbon monoxide, acid gases, nitrogen oxides and cancer-causing dioxins.

**Objection reason #12** Populations living near incinerators are potentially exposed by inhalation of contaminated air, consumption of contaminated foods, water, or dermal

contact with contaminated soil and in the water they drink collected in their tanks, from their roofs!

**Objection reason #13** Many, many millions of \$\$\$ are given to the Incineration industry by way of subsidies and grants by the Federal Govt under the guise of being renewable energy. Incineration is NOT, clean, green, or renewable, that money belongs to REAL renewable energy projects and technology!

**Objection reason #14** "All incinerators (which includes gasification, pyrolysis and plasma arc technologies) are in fact a waste of energy. Due to the relatively low calorific value of waste, incinerators only make small amounts of energy while destroying large amounts of reusable materials,"

**Objection reason #15** "Burning waste for energy also drives a climate-changing cycle of new resources being extracted from the earth, processed and shipped around the world, and then wasted in incinerators,"

**Objection reason #16** "Burning waste also pollutes people and the environment. Mercury, dioxins, lead, and other pollutants come from burning waste. In terms of climate impacts, incinerators emit more carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) per unit of electricity than coal-fired power plants."

**Objection reason #17** "Energy from incinerators is not renewable. Paper and metals come from finite natural resources and plastics and tires are fossil fuels. Burning these resources creates a demand for 'waste' and discourages real waste management solutions".

**Objection reason #18** According to the IPCC Fourth Assessment report on Climate Change, "Waste minimization, recycling, and re-use represent an important and increasing potential for indirect reduction of GHG emissions through the conservation of raw materials, improved energy and resource efficiency and fossil fuel avoidance."

**Objection reason #19** Waste incinerators all generate ash that is contaminated with toxic heavy metals and persistent organic pollutants (POPs) such as dioxins and furans.

The levels of contamination vary according to the waste burned, the process used and configuration of the pollution controls on the smoke stack but all solid and air emissions contain contaminants, many of which can be at a level that can impact on human health and the environment depending on the disposal method and exposure.

**Objection reason #20** According to the incinerator industry most incinerators generate 1 tonne of contaminated ash for every 4 tonne of waste burned. This includes smaller volumes of highly toxic 'fly ash' and larger volumes of less toxic 'bottom ash'. There is no market for incinerator ash and it must be disposed of to landfill.

**Objection Reason #21** INCINERATORS UNDERMINE THE RECYCLING SECTOR! - Waste incinerators seek the highest calorific value fuels available to burn as this increases the efficiency of their energy. Unfortunately, those high calorific value wastes are also highly valued for recycling. These include plastics, paper, woodwaste and cardboard. By competing for the same materials as recycling operations incinerators undermine the recycling sector and destroy valuable resources and their embedded energy



**Objection Reason #22** Incinerators provide a classic case of environmental injustice!

Pollution produced by burning garbage subjects communities near waste incinerators — disproportionately made up of low-income, people of colour — to harmful, costly, and avoidable public health risks.

**Objection Reason #23** - The TOXIC TOLL of Waste Incineration!

Please see infographics below.



**Objection Reason #24** - Vulnerable subpopulations may be exposed to higher levels of outdoor air pollution than the rest of the population.

**Objection Reason #25** - “If you are using something and then, after a single life, saying, ‘I’m done with it and I’m going to burn away the fundamental molecules and elements and everything else to release a bit of energy’, then that’s not good - UNSW engineering professor Veena Sahajwalla.

**Objection Reason #26** - WtE Incineration is NEITHER clean, green or renewable, it is TOXIC, DEADLY and dangerous to the environment and a contributor to climate change. The carbon intensity of incineration could be as high as 550g CO<sub>2</sub>e/kWh – thus double of that of the EU grid average. So problematic are the incinerators’ emissions that the EU has discontinued their funding – previously a major source of WtE investment.

**Objection Reason #27** - Greens Western Australian MP and the party’s waste spokesman, Robin Chapple, says it is inappropriate for grants or loans meant for green energy to go to waste-to-energy programs.

“It’s consuming, in a large degree, a petroleum product into an energy stream which produces CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent,” Chapple says.

“We managed to control the emissions, like dioxins, but we are still turning the plastics into a greenhouse gas. If you have a good recycling program which deals well with waste, the feedstock for incineration disappears.”

**Objection Reason #28** - In 2018 another NSW WtE proposal was REJECTED for good reasons and the ONLY thing that has changed is that they are moving this deadly toxic industry to the regional areas...for now. It's just a foot in the door and we will all be affected by this decision, including future generations.

- 1) Does moving to regional areas mean that it will be safe? NO!
- 2) Does this mean they won't build them in other areas in the future? NO!
- 3) Should building them in regional areas be a good enough reason to give this proposal a chance? NO!
- 4) Will this proposal be any different, NO!

So much money has been spent on trying every trick in the book to get this passed it really makes you think how much they will be making if it gets passed. Those \$\$\$ signs in their eyes are blinding the decision-makers to the human and environmental cost to the rest of us. That is ALL WtE Incineration is about, THE MONEY, not the huge cost to human health and the environment for many, many generations to come.

**Objection Reason #29 -**

NOTHING will make the emissions safe. WtE Incinerator will still be pumping out EXTREMELY DANGEROUS TOXIC EMISSIONS into the homes, lungs and lives of the residents of NSW, into the environment of residents of NSW, into the food consumed by the residents of NSW and beyond, and leaving behind a HUGE AMOUNT OF TOXIC ASH, to be landfilled and dealt with by FUTURE GENERATIONS and this is NOT acceptable in any way. This is even more dangerous in Tarago where the water table is not too far below the surface and Veolia has come up with a very poor and untested (by any other WtE company in the world) plan to bury it wrapped in some fabric, does this sound safe to you?

HUMAN HEALTH RISKS, AIR AND WATER QUALITY.  
Human health TRUMPS making money, EVERY SINGLE TIME!

**Objection Reason #30** - WE ALL DESERVE TO LIVE WITHOUT THE THREAT TO OUR HEALTH and ENVIRONMENT from TOXIC INCINERATION! This decision will affect not only OUR LIVES but the lives of FUTURE GENERATIONS, and will only benefit GREEDY COMPANIES to make more money at a HUGE PERSONAL COST TO US! WE SAY NO TO HAVING OUR LIVES AND FUTURES DESTROYED!

**Objection Reason #31** - The EU classifies incineration as an unacceptable risk under their Pandemic Recovery and Resilience advisory to its member states. Meanwhile Australia rolls out the red carpet 🙄

INFORMATION FROM EUROPEAN UNION INSTITUTIONS, BODIES, OFFICES AND AGENCIES  
EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Commission Notice

Technical guidance on the application of 'do no significant harm' under the Recovery and Resilience Facility Regulation

(2021/C 58/01)

**Objection Reason #32** - The rest of the world knows how dangerous and toxic this industry is and they are starting to make the necessary changes to shut down Waste to Energy

Incineration completely, removing subsidies and grants, not approving new incinerators, etc. This is why this industry has moved to Australia, they are running out of places to build this toxic technology. WE DO NOT NEED TO MAKE THE SAME MISTAKES THAT THE REST OF THE WORLD HAS LEARNT BY, Incineration belongs NOWHERE!

**Objection Reason #33** - WE ALL DESERVE BETTER! THIS TECHNOLOGY IS NOT THE WAY FORWARD, NOT THE WAY FOR OUR FUTURE and WILL CARRY A HUGE PRICE THAT WE WILL ALL HAVE TO PAY, IF THIS IS ALLOWED TO GO AHEAD.

References are available for all of these objections.