Marie Flood
110 Belmont St

Alexandria 2015

Submission from:

I object to the proposal Woodlawn ARC: SSD-21184278

I declare that I have not made any reportable political donations in the last two years.

I acknowledge and accept the Department of Planning's disclaimer and declaration.

My submission is as follows:

My name is Marie Flood and I live in Alexandria NSW. I object to this project for the following reasons:

I am very concerned about the human health impacts of the toxic emissions that would be released over country towns and the cities of Goulburn and Canberra.

It is well known that there is no safe level of air pollution and the emissions from energy from waste incinerators is particularly toxic. Breathing in toxic heavy metals and acid gases causes serious illness and death. The particulates PM10 and PM2.5 penetrate human organs and enter the bloodstream.

Toxic pollution from the energy from waste facility would enter waterways and agricultural land and from there enter our foodchain. Please consider the international research that has confirmed these dangers.

The energy produced by burning waste is extremely dirty energy, even dirtier than coal-fired. It is not at all the 'win-win' the industry claims.

The production of 380,000 tonnes of extremely toxic fly ash and 1.9 million tonnes of bottom ash is reason enough to rule this project out.

I am appalled at the proposal to inflict this dangerous facility on a rural town already burdened by a landfill for Sydney's waste. If incineration is not safe for Sydney (as the government regulation about banning incinerators in the Sydney basin implies) then they are not safe anywhere.

It is not necessary to develop incineration in NSW as there are alternatives to burning rubbish. Landfills are ghastly but not as dangerous as incineration. Methane from landfills can be captured and used, so that the emissions from landfill are much lower than those released by incineration.

It is critical that burning plastics does not become part of our response to the massive amounts of plastic used in society, all of which are difficult to dispose of and do immense damage to our water and land environments.

Burning plastic releases dioxins, furans and mercury into the atmosphere. Plastic can be left in landfill relatively safely while alternative handling and reuse methods and technologies are pursued. The plastics crisis can be handled by avoiding and banning its use, as well as recycling and reusing it. This can only happen over time and plastic needs to be stored safely until solutions that do not involve burning are found.

I reject Veolia's claim in their EIS that the project is in the public interest.

In making their submission Veolia may not be required to consider alternative proposals and technologies that would better respond to the growing waste crisis in NSW. I contend however that it is incumbent on the assessors of the proposal to consider whether alternatives are available or are in development that would 1. have economic and social benefits to the regions in which they are located, 2. contribute to the creation of a circular economy and 3. Avoid high levels of toxicity negatively impacting communities, other industries and the environment.

Government has a responsibility to consider broad and long term solutions to waste, rather than adopting to the narrow and self-interested focus of waste industry proponents.

Approving this project would be a step away from the government policy of moving to a circular economy. It would be likely to lock in the burning of waste and the release of toxic emissions for 30 years. Creation of monster incinerator that requires a constant source of waste would be very likely to hold back the creation of a circular economy and responsible waste handling practices.

Government is responsible for intergenerational equity, including strategies to solve the waste crisis in a way that will preserve and protect the environment and not contribute to global warming.

