

Submission
No 805

**INQUIRY INTO PROPOSED ENERGY FROM WASTE
FACILITIES**

Name: Name suppressed

Date Received: 30 October 2025

Partially
Confidential

To the Select Committee on the Proposed Energy to waste Facilities,

I'd like to be clear that Incineration of plastics, building material and general waste is a danger to Australia's future in so many ways.

Considering the terms of reference outlined in the Inquiry into proposed energy from waste facilities, I have deep concerns over Veolia's initial Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) submitted to the NSW Department of Planning in 2022 and the subsequent recent Amendment to this submission. They have failed to provide sufficient scientific proof that the technology is safe for the region, Veolia's EIS was poorly written and failed to outline safe handling or management of chemical residue such as the fly ash, the paid experts they employed to write their data are yet to provide responses that satisfactory answer the 600 or more strong objections to their submitted statement.

If companies cannot substantially provide 100% complete scientific reports that cover every single detail of the process from start to finish to substantiate the risks posed to health and the environment then they should not be allowed to proceed with their projects.

A moratorium should be put in place, the Australian Government has a responsibility to ensure these projects are completely risk free to human health or the environment, the research needs to be done by genuine scientist who aren't being paid by the waste industry to write reports that display clear bias.

Why is it that the Sydney Incinerator proposal did not get approved due to the fact that it was a risk to human health and yet it is OK for it to be placed amongst our community? I find that disgusting, disrespectful and a completely ignorant.

We could not put in a certain grey water system on our house because we were in 'Sydney's water catchment' and yet an incinerator which will belch out forever chemicals over 25 years is acceptable?

I am not a scientist, I am a resident who lives 11km from the current Woodlawn bioreactor site, in Tarago where they propose to put the incinerator. We drink the water that we harvest from our rooves, the animals on our property drink from the four dams we have. My number one concern for these projects is human health and the impacts on the environment.

The emissions of Furans and Dioxins, ammonia along with many other chemicals and even PFAS coming from the stack and in the Fly Ash dust being transferred is too risky for human health.

Any Ministers who approve this, can look forward to class actions in the future, as they did for the PFAS in Oakey QLD, Williamtown NSW.

Having worked in Oakey and with a husband who is ex-Defence the frightening letter in the mail, to advise that rigorous blood tests were required to check for PFAS in the system was awful, and we would not wish that on anyone. No one should have to get tested for chemicals just for drinking water where they work or live.

To this, the fact that we live in a cool climate region, means that most of the year the air pressure is low and whatever chemicals are coming from that stack are not just going to dissipate up and out, they are staying low and dropping in the form of fog, dew and condensation in the immediate area. Over a period of time, the dioxins, ammonia and furans endanger the current biodiversity in this beautiful region, including Lake George, on which Woodlawn sits on the North Eastern edge of. It has been reported that similar waste to energy incinerator facilities in Japan and Europe emit pollution including Acid gases, Nitrogen Oxides, heavy metals, persistent organic pollutions also as listed above (Report by the NSW Chief Scientist and Engineers Energy from Waster report 2020).

Looking at so much research over the last four years of this Incinerator journey we have been on, it's research such as: The International Pollutants Elimination Network (IPEN) report (2021) which highlights the technologies suitable for replacing incineration.

"Non-combustion technologies for the destruction of persistent organic pollutant (POP) waste have been developed and commercialised since the 1990's. They provide a non-polluting and effective alternative to incineration of POPs waste, an old technology which continues to release and emit

unintentional POPs (UPOPs). Incineration has become a trap with a never-ending cycle of attempted POPs waste destruction followed by more unintentional POPs creation in the form of dioxins and furans from the combustion process. Non-combustion processes can destroy the same waste and allow us to break free of the POPs cycle once and for all.”

(ref 2. <https://ipen.org/documents/non-combustion-technology-pops-waste-destruction>).

Which proves there are alternatives out there, I can't understand why the waste industry which is controlled by a monopoly, gets to dictate how Australia's waste is managed, without offering all of the solutions. A circular economy is a sound model.

Please consider the health of those that live in the communities around these facilities, the risk to the environment and the long term effects this will have on our climate.

Sincerely

Tarago resident