BASELINE STUDY: Ahead to have this done in the surrounding area. URGENT. Agricultural produce needs to be sampled + tested + monitored regularly. The first round needs to be very conscientiously done to serve as a Baseline study ~~must be financed by Indaver~~. Who will do this? Indaver / E.P.A. (15)

The rest of what I have say needs to be said in case unlikely events happen; namely an incineration process mishap and environmental damage occurring. Councillor Nods comments must be noted

~~**CHART.** Test Beef – at least for assurance purpose.~~

How would Carronstown Incinerator affect me personally in on 80 cow dairy farmer on 100 acres. There is a forth-coming E. U. Nitrate Directive ⟶ Winter feed will need to be out sourced and land rented in order to comply with Stocking rate conditions especially, if I get more Milk Quota and increase production.

N52 Line, so bulky feed (fodder) must likely grown S + E closer to Carronstown. The winter period is 6 months. In a mishap I could be bringing contaminated feed home.

F. S. A. I. says 2 basic conditions must be met by Incinerator Companies. 850 C adequate testing/monitory of produce in the vicinity. I submit that this is a short sighted policy. In recent incinerator mishaps, several weeks had passed before the problem was identified.

In my situation a crop of maize for silage could contaminate my milk even though I live outside the Indaver 5 km zone. Conversely a dairy farmer farming in exactly the same fashion within the 5 km zone at the time when the problem occurs might be found to have a clear test.

I submit that the movement of cattle fodder round the country has not been considered by F. S. A. I., DOA or E. P . A. or DOE. And Indaver will refuse to entertain a claim for contamination outside the 5 km zone. Clearly Public Administration must develop policy based on good information, not arbitory specification, or simply say so.

A plume or radius may not correspond with defacto reality and I do not believe that the homework is done. And the proof of this is the behaviour of DOA when I made approaches to get information in how a farm restriction regime would work. Lots of letters and the impasse went right to the Taoiseachs Office (inc DOE) (It's a poker game and keep the card close to your chest). The only replies I did receive were not answers to the questions asked.

In my objection, I speak of Raison D'Etate/States Reasons. We have Irish States Reason here. And what do I mean by this? I mean that farm restrictions will depend on already existing DOA Emergency powers. DOA is secretive and I want good information. And they behave sheepishly and without transparency.

I believe their plan is to have no plan and use tile power of emergency'. This is ~~an~~ arrogant ~~and amoral afterthought~~, Crises management with an element of the secret trial. Now that is a very negative comment, but I really wish to be positive.

They don't want you to pay attention to them – positive

The entire subject regimes consideration by a multi-departmental committee i.e. DOA, DOE, E. P. A. and F. S. A I. As it is no one has any knowledge of a plan or policy to deal with a chemical contingency from a food or agriculture viewpoint. The present reliance ~~a~~ on DOA emergency powers is a shot cut and is not part of the integrated development of the Incineration industry.

My objection outlines a very unpleasant scenario. The state owes a duty of care to members of the farming community. The State and the incinerator companies need to sort out their problems in this respect and not make any farmer a fall guy. I want both parties bound to justice. No one disowning problems and I really mean disowning them and justice denied.

Justice delayed in justice denied.

Justice to expensive and uncertain is also justice denied.

A failure to write a 3 party justice condition in the licence for an economically VULNERABLE group must raise eye-brows and prompt a search for the right question.

Mr John Ahorne

A former ~~[illegible]~~ Meath IFA bonnt Executive spoke to Mr Ahorne on mon evening last about baseline study.

Bonnan + McGuinness were offered by Indaver a baseline study which they would not have to pay for. They did not accept.

There is an implication here that the farming community will have to finance a baseline study + they 2 are getting a version or preference.

~~I understand that the first round of testing will~~ should ~~serve as the farmers baseline + that farmers should not be out of pocket.~~

Will I advise the 2 farmers to approach E.P.A. for advice?