

**Submission  
No 377**

## **INQUIRY INTO 'ENERGY FROM WASTE' TECHNOLOGY**

**Name:** Mr Phil Bradley

**Date received:** 29 May 2017

---

Dear Sir/Madam,

PORTFOLIO COMMITTEE NO. 6 – PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT

NSW Parliament Standing Committee Inquiry into 'Energy from waste' technology

TERMS OF REFERENCE

The Portfolio Committee No. 6 is inquiring into and reporting on matters relating to the waste disposal industry in New South Wales, with particular reference to 'energy from waste' technology, but my submission relates only to Terms of Reference a) and b) below, by way of example with my objections to the proposed Eastern Creek Energy from Waste Incinerator.

a) the current provision of waste disposal and recycling, the impact of waste levies and the capacity (considering issues of location, scale, technology and environmental health) to address the ongoing disposal needs for commercial, industrial, household and hazardous waste

b) the role of 'energy from waste' technology in addressing waste disposal needs and the resulting impact on the future of the recycling industry

I STRONGLY OBJECTED TO THE EASTERN CREEK WESTERN SYDNEY INCINERATOR PROJECT (NEXT GENERATION ENERGY FROM WASTE FACILITY) AND ASKED THAT IT BE REJECTED AS IT IS AN UNACCEPTABLE WASTE DISPOSAL PROVISION

Some of my main serious concerns follow:

1. Pollution

Sydney residents are already exposed to excessive pollutants that are causing serious health ailments. We do not want any more toxic emissions smog being trapped and lingering in the air we breathe, especially so in Sydney Basin's atmospheric temperature inversion effect!!

The Proposed Incinerator site at Eastern Creek is not only central to the densely populated Sydney Basin, but also close to residential areas including family homes and three nearby schools, Minchinbury Public School, James Erskine Primary and Erskine Park High School. Exposing young people to pollutants and air borne fine particles < PM2.5, is especially risky and serious.

Releasing more toxic emissions into our communities' air creates even worse health outcomes for Sydney families, in particular those in Western Sydney. This is particularly so as these emissions include dioxin, which even at low levels, should not be proposed in our highly populated Sydney Basin which already suffers from pollution trapped by its inverted atmospheric effect!

For Australia to comply with its international obligations under the Stockholm Treaty on Persistent Organic Pollutants it should not approve any waste incinerators.

A report released Saturday 21st January 2017 by the Committee of Sydney shows Blacktown as an area already with high rates of cardiovascular disease, and Incinerator emission will only increase these rates further. The world's largest incinerator proposed for Blacktown LGA will not comply with

the Health Commission's directive for better health outcomes for Western Sydney families. It will only give us outcomes far worse for health.

Incinerator waste is admitted by the proponent to be continually changing, so therefore the chemical nature of the incinerator emissions will change also, thereby making opportunities very limited for residents to avoid predicted emissions with highly adverse health effects. Toxic metals such as arsenic, mercury, cadmium and dioxin are universally present in incinerator emissions and present in high concentrations in the fly ash. Any addition of these Persistent Organic Pollutants, however small, to the Western Sydney community's air shed compromises our health, particularly for our children. The only method to eliminate and minimise dioxin formation from waste management is to avoid incineration and adopt alternatives, including by the minimisation of waste and recycling and/or reuse where possible.

Given that more toxic emissions will be released into our communities' breathing air shed, it clearly cannot be claimed that the project would create "better health outcomes for Western Sydney Families"!

Also, why should the nearby families have to put up with 3 years of construction noise pollution - "Generally the works are to be carried out during the day, however some activities require continuous construction and therefore may take place outside of standard working hours".

Once the Incinerator is up and running 24 hours a day 7 days per week, the noise of running the Incinerator, enormously increased heavy vehicle traffic and fumes will seriously impact on the health and amenity of families and individuals.

## 2. "Green and Renewable Energy" Misinformation and Climate Change

The Next Generation's Environmental Impact Statement for the Incinerator states:

"the main objectives of the proposed development are to offer a viable alternative to the burning of fossil fuels by utilising a green and renewable energy source capable of servicing approximately 200,000 homes through the export of 137.3 MW energy ..."!

This is clearly incorrect and grossly misleading. To state this as a main objective, in itself, leads the public to doubt the veracity of everything else that the proponent claims!

The content of the Next Generation NSW Pty Ltd' amended Environmental Impact Statement does not comply with "The Renewable Energy (Electricity) Act 2000", which specifically excludes fossil fuel based materials such as plastics and wood.

Also, MW is not a unit of "energy", but a unit of "power".

Mass combustion Incinerators rank as one of the dirtiest known forms of energy, producing far more carbon dioxide per unit of energy generated than coal, oil or gas fired power stations. Burning waste fuels based on carbon and petrochemicals, which are fossil fuels, and burning plastics derived from fossil fuels does not create "green" energy.

To argue this waste would otherwise break down in landfill to (extremely damaging greenhouse) methane gas is incorrect for plastics in the time frame of this our "critical decade" to address climate

change and misleading in respect to other waste, which should all be trapped and burnt for energy at the landfill site as already occurs at some sites.

### 3. Support for the Submissions of Blacktown City Council and of Resident Melinda Wilson

I would also like to give wholehearted support generally for the numerous additional concerns raised in the submissions of Blacktown City Council and of resident Melinda Wilson in objecting to and opposing the proposed "The New Generation" Incinerator Project. I would rather name it more appropriately "The Noxious Generation" Incinerator and urge its rejection!

### 4. Conclusion

The TNG Incinerator project in my judgement is NOT in the public interest, is NOT ecologically or socially sustainable and is of dubious true economic value, especially when health, environmental and other costs are taken into account!

I would argue that this is the case with any incinerator used to burn inadequately controlled waste or waste likely to produce dioxins, ultra fine particles or any other toxic emissions. By far the best way to address the appalling environmental and economic problem of waste is by minimisation of waste and its recycling and/or reuse in every way possible.

Phil Bradley (B.Eng - Civil & Grad Dip Ed)