(21)

Áine Walsh – 10.3.2005

Who are the No Incineration Alliance?
We are a group of people from the locality, from all walks of life (mothers, fathers, sisters brothers, housewives, marketing managers, small business directors, school children, fishermen, nurses, scientists, shop workers, painters and decorators, students, accountants, etc.), from all political persuasions. We came together to unite and try to fight the threat of incineration in our locality, and across Ireland, and to try to lobby for more sustainable waste management systems, based on the principles of the 3 R's and composting. We are not for profit and non-political, though we enjoy the support of all the major parties locally.

We are aligned to other campaigns throughout the country and abroad. We are members of Zero Waste Ireland. We have tried to educate ourselves, and in turn others in the community and Authorities, on the issue of incineration.

We are not professional campaigners. We all have full time jobs, families and other commitments, therefore the work we put into this has been both sporadic and consistent.
When we formed, our three main objectives were to :-

1) educate;
2) lobby / campaign to get this incinerator stopped and
3) to propose workable alternatives.

In an effort to further these goals we have enjoyed learning from experts in various fields. Many of the NIA have attended Indaver's presentations and read their literature, of which there is much. Some have also travelled to their site in Belgium. For balance, we have read considerably about the anti-incineration arguments, had public meetings with guest speakers from Ireland and abroad who are experienced in this field, eg.

- Prof Paul Connett from the US (Zero Waste);
- Dr Vyvyan Howard (UK - WHO adviser, toxicologist, specialist in pollutant effects on foetal development, particulate matter and other issues),
- Dr Sarah Steingraber (US - cancer survivor, author, ecologist),
- Dr Elizabeth Cullen (IE – medical practitioner, Irish Doctors Environmental Association);
- Mr Barry Friesen (Canada - Zero Waste implementor for the municipality of Halifax, Nova Scotia).

You may remember that we coordinated a meeting for members of the EPA with **Prof Howard** in March 2003, where this eminent toxicologist outlined the reasons why incineration should be rejected on health grounds, and we also sent copies of his peer reviewed, published papers for your perusal. We remember some of the individuals that he met, and others we have spoken to on and off in the EPA, commenting that they were **'on our side' but their hands were tied.** This condition is not specific to the EPA, we've encountered it in the Planning and Education arenas, and we consider a terrible state of play for the individuals involved, and the country as a whole. Therefore, we're imploring you to please be brave – adhere to your mission statement '**To protect and improve the natural environment for present and future generations, taking into account the environmental, social and economic principles of sustainable development'.** Please reject incineration and help

Ireland choose a cleaner, greener and more economically viable waste management strategy to the benefit of our nation's health, wealth and heritage.

Why are we against incineration of municipal waste?

There are many reasons why we are against the incineration of municipal waste. These we deem to be legitimate and proven. We are not here to be vexatious, negative or truculent – we are here for the good of our health.

The views we have on incineration are **shared by many communities around the world**. We contend that incineration of municipal waste in Ireland is unnecessary, wasteful, dangerous, immoral and economically reckless. We understand that incineration is practiced in many countries of the world for many reasons (quick solution, population density, land conditions, eg. Netherlands, etc.), but we also know that there are issues with incineration in many of these countries, with many of the older facilities being closed down because of non-compliance with emission standards, or not economically viable. We are also frighteningly aware of some 'modern' facilities never being commissioned or having problems for the very same reasons, eg. the incinerator in Karlsruhe, Germany, that the Louth County Councillors were brought to as a 'state-of-the-art' example of waste management which didn't go into operation – i.e. they were being shown around an expensive and inefficient white elephant.

Ireland has a proud and independent spirit, we take great solace in the fact that the people of **Ireland stood tall against the threat of nuclear power** in the '70's, and the authorities followed through. We very much hope that, despite performance to date, the EPA will review it's decision on the draft licence, re-read the tomes of supporting literature supplied by the NIA and others highlighting the dangers of incineration, and be brave enough to protect the health and environment of the people they're paid to serve.

During our An Bord Pleanala Oral Hearing we were not allowed bring up the issue of health, therefore we hoped to have our concerns in this regard taken seriously by the EPA. Incinerators emit many pollutants to air, to water and in solid form - Dioxin, Furans, Particulate Matter, Greenhouse Gases, Heavy Metals, Arsenic, Cadmium, Lead, Mercury and many more. Each of these have negative health effects in various quantities. Even though Indaver have advised these will be within EU limits, we fear for long term exposure, exposure to unknown pollutants, any exposure to dioxin, the monitoring and precise evaluation of emissions and legislation thereof, and also the degree of self monitoring within the industry, and the draft licence you've issued.

The government-commissioned HRB document on the possible effects of various waste management streams was published since the application was lodged with you by Indaver, the findings of which have been submitted to you as part of ours and others objections. This independent Board found that Ireland was lacking in sufficient monitoring programmes to be in a position to accept this technology into our midst.

Dr Anthony Staines, an eminent epidemiologist and member of the HRB has also advised on various occasions about the tendency for emission limits to be reduced over time as the level of toxicity of many pollutants is understood more fully - for example the WHO's dioxin exposure levels which dropped from values of 10 to 1-4 over 8 years; will they drop again considering dioxin is a known carcinogen? Can Indaver cope? Can the monitoring systems detect excesses in a timely manner? I think the issue of dioxin and it's monitoring have been discussed to death in this Oral Hearing – and there'll be constant friction between the two sides on this, but could I just make mention for the record that we, as a community, would not be impressed with an extra exposure to dioxin, regardless

of how minimal Indaver contend it to be; we are also slightly wary of the monitoring system to be used by Indaver, i.e. it's not real-time data, spikes are smoothed, it could be weeks before we realize that a pollution event has been caused, etc. We understand their difficulty, i.e. that this system is the best on the market at the minute, but it still falls short of the mark for immediate response capabilities.

We understand from other facilities, that sometimes it's difficult to keep within current emission levels for various pollutants, so of course we fear for the future when/if these emission levels are reduced. From experience, once tolerance guidelines are issued, they never go up, eg. drink driving – a couple of years ago it was okay to have a few drinks, now we're down to 2 units, and more realistically people err on the side of none at all – which'll probably be the route in the future – exposure to passive smoking is similar – firstly take it out of certain locations, eg. buses, planes, then offices, now it is out of Ireland totally.

Examples of breaches / accidents have been documented in such facilities as Indaver's own Belgian plant who exceeded their emission levels. As recently as January 2005 we read about a fire at an incinerator in the US which required the evacuation of 1,500 people living within a few miles of the plant. In November 2004 an explosion in an Argentinian incinerator caused the death of an operator and injury to five fire fighters. The smoke from this could be seen up to 25 km away. These are terrible tragedies for companies to expose communities to, so our fear of the combined Bermuda triangle of a gas pipeline (under the site) a quarry with constant blasting abutting the site, and an incinerator on the site, less than 500 metres from houses and playing fields, we feel are justified.

We submitted many articles from medical and public health journals from all over the world which highlight issues relating to exposure to certain pollutants and incinerators, which generally conclude that there have been significant negative effects on human health in the vicinity of these facilities. Indaver have often dismissed these saying that they relate to 'old' facilities. I'd therefore like to share the most recent re-print we've secured from the Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health, 2005:59:101-105, by EG Knox, UK, entitled **Childhoood cancers and atmospheric carcinogens**. The main results are "Significant birth proximity relative risks were found within 1.0 km of hotspots for carbon monoxide, PM_{10} particles, VOCs, nitrogen oxides, benzene, dioxins 1,3-butadiene, and benz(a)pyrene. Calculated attritubale risks showed that most child cancers and leukaemias are probably initiated by such exposures. They conclude that 'the mother probably inhales these or related materials and passes them to the foetus across the placenta'. Though we welcome the results of this study, we find them terrifying, our community is already exposed to some of these pollutants through the large cement facility at Platin, which operates around the clock all year around, we definitely don't need or want any further pollutants threatening our children's lives.

We are also very aware of the **growing population** in the vicinity and the demographic of many of the new house-holders in the East Meath/Duleek / Drogheda area, i.e. young families moving down from Dublin to more affordable housing, as well as people from our own community. This isn't an assertion, this is fact as many of the NIA have gone door to door more than once in the area sharing information or fundraising, and we've met these young people on the doorsteps. Recent reports in the Drogheda Independent from various studies have already highlighted that Drogheda has elevated levels of certain cancers (eg. lung), therefore for the EPA to further expose an already 'burdened' or 'sensitive' community to more carcinogens would be untenable.

We note in the top paragraph of page 12 of the EPA's '**Inspectors Report**' relating to the draft licence, that you've decided to dismiss or ignore the public health literature submitted, bar one

article which concluded that the authors 'could not infer causal effect' from exposure - this we find to be a real shortfall by the EPA's Inspectors. It may even be a case of the 'devil citing scripture to suit himself' - we can all do this - this is the role of Indaver and the opposition (us) - the hope was that the EPA, as national ombudsmen, and 'independent' assessors of the facts, would take a more balanced view. We also hoped that the 'precautionary principle' would prevail in cases where there was doubt. Based on submissions from us, the Irish Doctors Environmental Association, a copy of the letter signed off by 16 GP's in the local area, Prof Howard's evidence, we believe that there are strong points of doubt with regard to the safety of public health - and we find your dismissal of this to be a great flaw in your efforts at assessing the data provided and available to assist in your decision making process. This omission also highlights what could be perceived as at best a 'charade of 'consultation', or at worst blatant negligence with regard to the safeguarding of our health, wealth and heritage.

Our community also has a fear of the fear of incineration, i.e. the **perception of living in proximity** to and eating food potentially contaminated by the by-products of this plant may cause stress related illnesses in our community, especially the close neighbours of the proposed development.

We understand that the EPA have admitted that there aren't any **adequate monitoring systems, baseline data or methodology for monitoring health in place** (correspondence between Dr Kelly and the Health Board). We therefore would like to once again re-iterate the fact that to go ahead with the incineration of municipal waste in Ireland, without adequate baseline data to monitor and track variation, would be a very reckless gamble for the EPA to take with the nation's human and animal health.

For the past 3 weeks, I've been lucky enough to be involved in an environmental project, on a trip to the Antarctic with people from all over the world, including members of the Worldwide Fund for Nature, and others. We watched evidence of global warming at first hand during a trip to the Larsen B Ice Shelf. Whilst there, the Kyoto protocol came into force. A Protocol which is trying to set guidelines for us all to adhere to try to halt global warming by the reduction of carbon emissions. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change have concluded a significant correlation between carbon emissions and temperature rise. Carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases are big contributors to global warming. Ireland, along with the other 140 signatory countries that make up 55% of the greenhouse gas emissions globally have committed to reducing them. We therefore find it incredulous that our EPA would authorize a facility which wantonly creates greenhouse gases, when there are alternative waste management strategies available which'll help Ireland comply with Kyoto.

Incinerators are expensive to build, run, maintain, monitor, feed, de-commission; the ash disposal raises further issues regarding costs. From a feasibility study as recent as 1999, commissioned by Meath County Council, it concluded that thermal treatment was more expensive per tonne that landfill. The same report for the North East designated Navan, Kingscourt, Dundalk and Carrickmacross as being the most suitable sites for locating a thermal treatment plant, should the Region choose the path of incineration. We therefore feel that our local authorities have let us down badly, and this is being compounded by the national 'push for incineration'. Firstly they chose this costly method of waste management, secondly they allow a Belgian semi-state pick whatever site it would like for Ireland's first proposed municipal waste incinerator. The An Bord Pleanala Oral Hearing highlighted the issues regarding site selection criteria, or lack of them, used by Indaver in arriving at this site. As highlighted in our submission, this site is on a limestone area, over a regionally significant aquifer, no-where near the 'optimal' sites selected in the initial scoping report for the North East, and many haul miles away from the major centres of waste arising in the North

East. It is quite evident that **Indaver retro-fitted a pick-and-mix of various site selection matrixes to 'make' the Carranstown site fit**, and against the wishes of the An Bord Pleanala inspector, and our community, was let away with this. Proximity to the limestone aquifer, educational facilities, etc. were dismissed as legitimate restrictions in the site selection process. For the record, besides Mount Hanover school, less than a km away from the site, and the playing fields opposite it, there are a total of 85 educational and healthcare facilities in an 8km radius of the proposed site. We understand that the EPA also has some 'say' over the site selection with regard to health and environmental impacts, and we therefore ask you for this to be further investigated, using the data already on file with An Bord Pleanala to help you arrive at a finding.

The **Waste Crisis** is another big bogey man that we're threatened with - but, with the recent commissioning of the Knockarlie dump at Kentstown, less than 5 miles away from the Carranstown site as the crow flies, we've more than met the Regional waste requirements for the Southern component of the North East. We were advised that approx 500,000 tonne of waste arises in the North East annually, of which, 50-70% can be recycled/composted, leaving approx 200,000 tonne for the 4 counties, of which there's capacity of 130,000 tonne per annum at Knockarlie, along with some smaller facilities to the North of the Region - thus proving that the North East would be glad of further streams for recyclables to reduce their residual waste, and is also already self sufficient in it's capacity for residual waste.

We'd like to raise the issue of how comprehensive Indaver's EIS was, with relation to **flora and fauna**, this was highlighted at the APB Oral Hearing, with such blatant omissions as the most protected bird in Ireland, i.e. the peregrine falcon, nesting in an adjacent quarry. When we compare and contrast the flora and fauna sections of the Indaver EIS against that done by Irish Cement Ltd for pretty much the same area, the Indaver edition leaves a lot to be desired. This makes us question further what else could have been skimmed over, forgotten, or intentionally ignored.

From the point of view of **sustainability** - incineration isn't energy recovery. In September 2002 the European Court of Justice ruled that municipal waste **incineration is always waste disposal and not recovery**. Therefore the euphemisms used regarding 'waste to energy', etc. are pretty hollow - our view that it is 'resource to waste'. As a logical follow on from this direction with regard to the waste hierarchy, incineration (disposal) should have parity on the triangle with disposal. Incineration **is not a renewable source of energy (EU 2001)**. It is a wanton burning of resources which could potentially have further use.

This is an **end of pipe solution** - i.e. we're not addressing the problem of waste arisings - instead of organizing systems that dispose of or recycle our waste, we need to design systems of production that generate little or no waste to begin with. If the EPA allow incineration, they are giving the wrong message, i.e. that it's alright to continue to produce excess packaging, to not re-use construction waste, to continue to make disposable products, etc. - this is wrong, and is doing the people of Ireland and our environment a huge dis-service. There has been a huge mindshift in the past five years (almost since this campaign began) with regard to waste management in Ireland. We gladly recycle through a green bin or bring bank system, and look forward to brown bins where household composting isn't an option. As John Ahern confirmed on Monday, this could potentially bring the average person's waste down by 50-70%, meeting the requirement of the Landfill Directive, without recourse to incineration.

With regard to **Food Safety** - as outlined in our submission - we fear for the threat of pollutants making our way into the food chain, and crossing into humans. This would carry the financial burden

of health costs for humans and animals, as well as the loss of earnings in Ireland's bread basket, i.e. the market garden of north Dublin and the fertile plains of Meath. We note in your Inspector's Report that you are depositing this squarely at the door of the Food Safety Authority of Ireland, and wonder whether this is just passing the buck – whether this is a further example of the dissociation in Irish systems (planning, licencing, health, food) – with facilities such as this, we need a holisitic view to be taken – otherwise the ball will be dropped, with the people of Ireland suffering the burden. Sheila's account of the Askeaton travesty highlights this dissociation very clearly.

The well documented **1999 Belgian dioxin incident** caused by contaminated matter being mixed with feed, illustrated how a sector and potentially an economy can be decimated by the actual incident, and the effects of lack of market confidence thereafter. This kind of thing highlights the fact that 'accidents happen' – just as they happened in the Indaver site in Belgium, with it's elevated emissions which led to the systems being shut down – stable doors and bolting horses. The fact is that if Indaver get in here with their pollutant laden processes, and anything goes wrong, the community is completely exposed to pollution incidents and the negative health and environmental impacts thereof.

We are aware of the fact that **Ireland has the lowest levels of dioxin in our cows' milk** in the EU dioxin inventory, and we would be very foolish to allow a facility into our midst which could in any way threaten this natural asset.

The HRB, the EPA and others have commented on Ireland's lack of monitoring capability. Many experts in the environmental monitoring field have also commented on the timeliness and accuracy of dioxin monitoring. When accidents occur, it could be weeks before we find out about them, i.e. the sample goes from Indaver to the dioxin testing facility at UCC (Cork), or abroad, to be read, then the results sent back, by which time the dioxin is out in the atmosphere, in the food chain, in our bodies, lodging in our fat cells, until it's mobilized and starts it's work as a carcinogen.

There are better **alternatives** from economic, safety, community, moral and resource use perspectives – these have been shared with you at length – and focus on the Zero Waste model. We have evidence from abroad, and also from Ireland that recycling, composting, re-use schemes can divert over 60% of waste from landfill, this more than meets the EU landfill Directives, thus negating the 'necessity' for incineration (eg. Renmore in Galway, New Zealand, Canberra, Nova Scotia and many other communities). From a personal point of view, through recycling and composting I put out maximum 2 wheely bins a year, with minimal effort, considering we don't even have a civic recycling facility in Drogheda yet – when this is in place and further recyclable streams opened up, this could come down further. Recycling is in it's infancy in Ireland, there has been no push back on industry yet to design biodegradable/recyclable packaging, when these schemes are followed through to fruition, and the supporting infrastructure in place, it'll be evident that incineration of common or garden municipal waste definitely isn't 'necessary'.

We thank Madam Chairperson, and the EPA, for the opportunity to voice these issues, many of which have already been outlined in our submissions, but which we felt didn't get adequate consideration. We look forward a reversal of the draft licence and a chance for Ireland to enjoy a sustainable, healthier, wealthier, greener future.

Áine Walsh (BSc Env Cons, MSc Env Sci)
On behalf of the No Incineration Alliance

HRB Report - Executive Summary - Page 6

Health Effects of Incineration -
There is some evidence that incinerator emissions may be associated with respiratory morbidity. Acute and chronic respiratory symptoms are associated with incinerator emissions.

A number of well-designed studies have reported associations between developing certain cancers and living close to incinerator sites. Specific cancers identified include primary liver cancer, laryngeal cancer, soft tissue sarcoma and lung cancer. It is hard to separate the influences of other sources of pollutants, and other causes of cancer, as a result, the evidence for a link between cancer and proximity to an incinerator is not conclusive.

Further research, using reliable estimates of exposure over long periods of time, is required to determine whether living near landfill sites or incinerators increases the risk of developing cancer. Studies of specific environmental agents and specific cancer may prove more definitive in the future.

Page 5
'The effect of exposure depends on the level and duration of exposure, but also, crucially, on characteristics of the people exposed. Children may be more susceptible to toxic effects of many chemicals, and may also behave in ways that increase their exposure. As an example, consider how much time small children and adults, respectively, spend in contact with the soil.'

Childhood cancers and atmospheric carcinogens

E G Knox

J Epidemiol Community Health 2005;59:101–105. doi: 10.1136/jech.2004.021675

Study objectives: To retest previous findings that childhood cancers are probably initiated by prenatal exposures to combustion process gases and to volatile organic compounds (VOCs); and to identify specific chemical hazards.

Design: Birth and death addresses of fatal child cancers in Great Britain between 1966 and 1980, were linked with high local atmospheric emissions of different chemical species. Among migrant children, distances from each address to the nearest emissions "hotspot" were compared. Excesses of outward over inward migrations show an increased prenatal or early infancy risk.

Setting and subjects: Maps of emissions of many different substances were published on the internet by the National Atmospheric Emissions Inventory and "hotspots" for 2001 were translated to map coordinates. Child cancer addresses were extracted from an earlier inquiry into the carcinogenic effects of obstetric radiographs; and their postcodes translated to map references.

Main results: Significant birth proximity relative risks were found within 1.0 km of hotspots for carbon monoxide, PM10 particles, VOCs, nitrogen oxides, benzene, dioxins, 1,3-butadiene, and benz(a)pyrene. Calculated attributable risks showed that most child cancers and leukaemias are probably initiated by such exposures.

Conclusions: Reported associations of cancer birth places with sites of industrial combustion, VOCs uses, and associated engine exhausts, are confirmed. Newly identified specific hazards include the known carcinogens 1,3-butadiene, dioxins, and benz(a)pyrene. The mother probably inhales these or related materials and passes them to the fetus across the placenta.

Correspondence to: Professor E G Knox, Mill Cottage, Front Street, Great Comberton, Pershore, Worcestershire WR10 3DU, UK

Accepted for publication 28 May 2004

Previous studies have shown (1) that childhood cancers and leukaemias in Great Britain exhibit geographical clustering of birth places: (2) they occur at increased densities around industrial sites with large scale combustion processes or using volatile organic compounds (VOCs), or which incinerate waste: (3) among children who moved house between birth and death the first addresses were closer to these hazards than were the later ones and migrations were more often directed away from a nearby hazard than towards one.[1–7] The increased effectiveness of early exposure, combined with the known effects of obstetric radiation exposures,[8] suggests that these diseases are often initiated prenatally.

The use of hazard proximity birth-death comparisons was initially dictated by the absence of a suitable set of non-cancer controls in the study from which the case material was extracted. These data were designed to measure the effects of obstetric radiation by comparing cases with paired non-cancer controls[8]; but the controls had been geographically matched with the cases and could not then be used to make geographical comparisons. The migration based method gave coherent results but was open to the possible objection that the migration patterns in the cancer children may have reflected a general population movement, perhaps related to area demolitions and subsequent rehousing. The recent publication of independent and comprehensive national pollution data now affords an opportunity to retest the atmospheric birth hazard hypothesis, and to identify specific chemical hazards. This is the objective of this study.

The UK National Atmospheric Emissions Inventory (NAEI) has recently published through its web site, detailed geographical displays of emissions of many different chemical species for 2001. These maps[9] were downloaded and individual pixels—resolved at 412.8 metres per pixel—were translated to grid references (see appendix, available on line http://www.jech.com/supplemental). Emission levels are expressed "per square km per year" on a seven point colour coded scale, using units that vary from grams (dioxins), through kilograms (chromium, nickel), to tonnes (sulphur dioxide, PM10 particles). Some were measured directly and others by ascertaining activities with known emission characteristics. Lower scale values are indicated as broad map zones, but the highest levels are shown as small clusters of red pixels or by individual pixels, often appearing to represent individual sources. The maps are readily available for inspection.

Except for the red pixel hotspots, the main scale divisions were too broad for effective comparisons of birth and death addresses. NAEI also points out that because of atmospheric diffusion the emission estimates do not directly represent the air we breathe. However, as in earlier studies, it is possible to compare birth and death addresses by measuring hotspot distances. The "case centred" method, used again here, examines the surroundings of each address in turn to identify the nearest of the hotspots. The selection is entirely objective and the resulting comparative distance measurements are available in very large numbers.

METHODS

The case material was extracted from a file of all 22 458 deaths from leukaemia or other cancer occurring before the 16th birthday in Great Britain between 1953 and 1980. They were classified into 11 main groups (lymphatic, myeloid, monocytic and unclassified/other leukaemias: lymphomas, nephroblastoma, CNS tumours, neuroblastoma, bone cancers, other solid cancers, and fatal "benign" tumours). Home addresses at death were always recorded and where parents

Abbreviations: VOC, volatile organic compound; NMVOC, non-methane volatile organic compound; NAEI, National Atmospheric Emissions Inventory

CHASE

Cork Harbour Alliance for a Safe Environment

Exclusively funded by voluntary donations and fundraising activities

Home About CHASE Events Quick Guide Newsletters Contact Us

NEWS & VIEWS
- Press Releases
- Media Reports
- Letters to the Media
- Related News

INFORMATION
- Questions & Answers
- Information in Depth
- Campaign History
- The Alternatives
- Glossary
- Photo Gallery

USEFUL LINKS
- Campaigns (Ireland)
- Campaigns (Internat)
- Zero Waste
- State/National Bodies
- International Bodies
- Other links

CONTACT US
- Make a donation
- Send us an email
- Become a member

PRESS RELEASE - 13 January, 2005

DON'T TELL US THERE IS NO DANGER.....
TWO HAZARDOUS WASTE INCINERATOR ACCIDENTS IN SEVEN WEE
One Explosion Leaves Man Dead – Other Fire Requires Evacuation of 1, People

Communities opposing the building of a hazardous waste incinerator in Cork Harbour were shoc learn of a fire at a hazardous waste incineration plant in El Dorado, Arkansas (Sunday 2 Jan, 20(which required the evacuation of 1,500 people living within a few miles of the plant. This accide comes hot on the heels of an explosion at another hazardous waste incinerator in Argentina (Ca Argentina, 18 Nov, 2004).

The Argentina incinerator explosion was so serious that one operator died in the blast and five fi were injured by the ensuing fireball that followed. The incinerator kiln exploded and immediatel sparked off a massive fire which caused a huge black cloud of smoke, which could be seen from neighboring towns up to 25km away. A series of further explosions followed, and flames reache highly flammable waste products and set them on fire.

Some 25 firefighters battled all day to extinguish the fire, requiring assistance by safety staff fro nearby Monsanto plant using their specialist Hazmat equipment on site. The fire destroyed the b housing the plant's Incinerator kiln.

A CHASE spokesperson said "News of these accidents both alarms and angers us. Don't tell us t no danger, don't tell us it couldn't happen here. Accidents aren't planned - they happen. These accidents, just seven weeks apart, bring home how dangerous incineration is, and how justified concerns of the Cork people are.

The Ringaskiddy site is situated on a gas pipline, in close proximity to a number of Sevesco Plan surrounded by towns and yards away from the Maritime College and the Naval Base. It is unthin what the outcome could be if a similar explosion happened on this site.

It would be criminal to proceed if there is even the smallest risk of an Argentina type explosion happening at Ringaskiddy."

----- ENDS ----

For further information contact:

Linda FitzPatrick, CHASE PRO 021 4374506 087 7410849
Mary O'Leary, CHASE Chairperson, 021 4811952 Mobile 086 8177737

CHASE - Cork Harbour Alliance for a Safe Environment, 1 Lr. Midleton Street, Cobh, Cork
Tel - 021 481 5564 Email - info@chaseireland.org