

Thank you for the opportunity to speak up on behalf of my community to urge your rejection of The Next Generation incinerator proposal. *I am unwavering in my opposition to this proposal.*

There is an unwavering tsunami of opposition towards this proposal, tens of thousands have signed petitions, written letters of objection and there continues to remain unresolved, alarming environmental and health concerns with the incinerator proposal as it stands today. *Stage 1*

Despite ~~nearly four~~ ⁵ years of effort and numerous meetings with experts, the proposal remains flawed, in breach of Government policies and the following statements continue to be ~~applied~~ *found in the expert assessments.*

- * Substantial discrepancies
- Machinery* * Performance guarantees not provided
- * Previous information provided contradictory
- * Estimate of emissions
- * Compliance remained unclear
- * Do not comply
- * Lack of clarity
- * Emitted pollutants

What is absolutely known now, the proposal before you is incapable of guaranteeing human health and that it will operate within acceptable and regulated standards. It is impossible to determine that the proposal will be safe for the community on many grounds, least of which is the fact that the diesel engines assessed in the proposal are not the confirmed ~~machinery~~ ^{diesel engines} that the proponent will install. *HZI technology, 35 countries*

We also know, due to ~~the~~ ^{Dr Paul Connett} evidence of *Dr Paul Connett (as addressed by Anthony Lewis)* that nanoparticles are emitted from incinerator processing. However there is no government regulation for any incinerator worldwide that sets an acceptable emission limit for nanoparticles. In addition there is no proven mechanism to accurately measure the nanoparticles. Currently Europe has regulations that measures down to 10 microns and they are considering lowering this to 2.5 microns, however nanoparticles are even smaller

than this. So how can the proposal before you today guarantee human health when it cannot measure the hazardous nanoparticulate emissions and there are no regulations to set an acceptable standard of emission?

Throughout the assessment process, the experts (EnRisk, HHRA and ARUP) have raised ^{major} significant concerns. Despite two significant amendments to the proposal, ARUP maintains its view the proposed development is inconsistent with the energy from waste policy. EnRisks advises it is not possible to be confident the human health risk assessment is appropriate and sufficiently conservative and therefore the risk to human health is unknown.

Furthermore, the proponent has failed to demonstrate a fully operational reference facility that treats like waste streams - a clear breach of the NSW Gvt policy. Without reference to a fully operational facility thermally treating the same waste feedstock, there is no certainty regarding the concentration and mix of pollutants in the emissions. As such, the air quality impacts and health risk estimates are unknown.

^{NSW Parliamentary Inquiry}
The Environmental Protection Authority, NSW Health and Blacktown and Penrith Local Councils and other experts in their field have raised consistent concerns which to date, have not been addressed by the proposal before us today.

Specifically here are a small number of damning and alarming statements presented by experts on this proposal:

- * Floc waste proposed as part of feedstock is potentially hazardous to health and floc waste has not been categorically eliminated from this proposal's waste stream.
- * It does not demonstrate how the risk of not safely treating chlorine will be appropriately managed over time
- * It failed to prove adherence to waste hierarchy. This ^{contravenes} ~~undermines~~ broader Gvt policy of reduce, reuse and recycle.
- * The exact diesel engines and emissions are yet to be confirmed
- * The proponent can operate the incinerator for up to 60 hrs a year whilst breaching ^{3.5 days} ~~ing~~ emission levels

- clearly demonstrating their acceptance of the emissions breaches is worrisome & despite the claims by UFBIS consultant that a computerised system will constantly monitor & cause immediate shut down if it breaches regulation levels.

As it stands now what will protect my community, our children, our agricultural produce from the uncertainties and dangers of this proposal?

- * A crane driver
- * A document of commitment
- * Another document listing conditions -

This remains unacceptable and will fail. - as I have witnessed ~~been~~ as a representative of the community.

I congratulate the Department of Planning on recommending that the incinerator proposal be refused by the Independent Planning Commission, as it is inconsistent with government policy and does not meet regulatory standards.

But what is most alarming to me and my community is the fact that a proponent has pushed ahead with this proposal, knowing full well it is in breach of a number of government policies, regulations and standards – and yet here we are today still debating whether such a proposal should be granted consent or not.

The only guarantee of protection for my community, for our families, our future and our farming from this flawed proposal is your final refusal.