

15th March 2005

Submission of CAROL DAVIS to the ^{EPA} Oral Hearing 41
on granting of a (IPC) License to Indaver, Ireland
for it's proposed incinerator at Carranstown
Duleek.

I ~~would~~ ~~like~~ to express my appreciation,
Chairman, of the open and inclusive way
in which you have conducted this Oral
Hearing.

At this juncture, I would like to feel
that we, the public, have been truly
heard, and not merely listened to.

It is a huge responsibility on any
community to represent the opposition to
the introduction of incineration into
Ireland. We have had that responsibility
thrust upon us, de facto, by the proposal
to site an incinerator at Carranstown,
Duleek.

This situation is a moral outrage, and
totally unjust. It is a dereliction of Govern-
ment's duty to the people of Ireland to
present a technology as contentious as
incineration, while not providing parity of
representation to it's alternatives. At the
very least, and even at this late stage,
a public debate must take place before
any decision is taken.

Opposition to incineration is growing all
the while, and political parties have
changed their policies on waste management

It is fair to say that Fianna Fail is now the only ~~party~~ totally pro-incineration party, albeit many of its more informed members are not in favour.

The introduction of incineration will change Ireland's status as a country with a clean and pure environment. ^{A treasure which we are lucky to possess} ~~National~~ ~~debate~~ The alternative of a Zero Waste approach to managing our waste has not been given any hearing in public. How can our decision-makers arrive at ^{informed} fair conclusions when they have had no opportunity to judge between one method and the other?

Instead we find ourselves at the end of a process, weighted heavily in favour of Incineration by virtue of (a) Government Policy, and (b) the declaration of a public pro-incineration position by Dr. Mary Kelly. I fervently hope that her position does not represent that of the EPA as a whole, although it further undermines the public's faith in ~~a process~~ the Agency's objective status.

You have a grave and onerous responsibility, Chairman. As you deliberate in the cold light of day, and arrive at your conclusions, I ask that you will not forget the people of Caranstown

3.

of Duleek and Drogheda, of Meath, of Ireland. The 27000 people who took the trouble to put their opposition in writing represent only a fraction of those who oppose incineration. The generations yet to come whose health will be born into an irrevocably changed Ireland, finally industrialised and polluted as the rest of the developed world turns away from incineration. What a legacy. What a responsibility on the EPA.

I ask you to invoke the Precautionary Principle which appears to have been set aside during this decision making process. Ireland is signatory to this principle. quote its main tenet

"... that the onus of responsibility vests with the proponent of a technology to prove its harmlessness, and not with the public to prove otherwise..."

Indaver most certainly have not proved that its incinerator will be harmless to our health and environment.

Finally Chairman I ask, in fact I'm not too proud to beg you from my heart to bring your own humanity to bear in your conclusions. I respectfully ask you to have the moral courage take into account not only the facts and figures, but the unfounded and well-founded fears of

4
the public. Restore our belief in the
EPA as our protector, you are our last
recourse in the public domain, and we rely
upon you.
Thank you for hearing me.

For reproduction purposes only.
Consent of copyright owner required for any other use.