

Good morning.

Chairperson, ladies and gentlemen.

Let me introduce myself. My name is Peter Walter. I am here to voice my grave concerns at the plan to install a toxic waste incinerator at Ringaskiddy, Co. Cork and the granting of a draft licence to Indaver.

My family recently moved to Cork. I have spent 20 years in the Merchant Navy and I now live and work in Ringaskiddy.

This Oral hearing

In some ways talking here today could be perceived by some to be a futile exercise when it comes to trying to stop this proposed development, particularly noting the well publicised links between the EPA and Indaver. However I am a great believer in the voice of the people and the power of collective determination. Over 250,000 people would live within 25 miles of this Toxic Waste incinerator.

The dangers of Incineration.

I believe that the concept of toxic waste incineration is a primitive and dangerous technology.

Scientific evidence shows that incinerators emit a cocktail of toxic chemicals including dioxins with that the undisputed serious health issues that these cause. The GAIA Global Alliance for Incinerator Alternatives has released a report "*Waste Incineration: A Dying*

Technology." This document explains why incinerators are an unsustainable and obsolete method for dealing with waste.

The report concludes that incineration is a dying technology. As a waste treatment technology, it is unreliable and produces a secondary waste stream far more dangerous than the original. Surely the EPA cannot dispute this.

Incineration as an energy production method is inefficient and wasteful of resources. As an economic development tool, it is a catastrophe, which drains money out of local communities and creates scarce and often dangerous jobs. The accident and explosions last year resulting in death prove this.

Ringaskiddy has already has its fair share of chemical industry and all the accompanying problems that bringsincluding horrible smells almost daily being pumped out by some chemical industries in the area.

This toxic waste incinerator signals a point of no return for Ringaskiddy, Cork and indeed Ireland.

Health Hazards.

I am a little sceptical of self-generated claims. In this case the chemicals discharged into the air and the projected emission levels. Foreexample a car manufacturer publishes emission levels of their products. These levels are tested under strict laboratory conditions with a known

hydrocarbon. Surely it is a different matter when the medium that is being burnt is an unknown quantity. How can it be possible to predict the levels of emissions with any degree of accuracy when we don't have a detailed analysis of what would be burned at this incinerator? \ These chemicals include, but are not limited to Hydrogen Floride, Nitrogen Oxides, Mercury, Arsenic and Lead.

Don't forget also that the United Nations Environment Program (UNEP) reports that incinerators account for 69% of dioxin emissions worldwide.

The toxic waste incinerator is designed for continuous operation burning a projected 200,000 tonnes of both hazardous and non hazardous waste each year if the project was to go ahead. Public opposition has killed many proposed and existing incinerators worldwide. More than 300 waste incinerator proposals in the United States have been defeated in the last 15 years because of public opposition.

Interestingly a toxic waste incinerator, which would be Canada's largest toxic waste incinerator, was dealt a real blow recently when the Ontario Environment Department rejected much of the company's data concerning human health and environmental impacts.

Indaver's EIS.

Let me quote. "The Environmental Impact Statement submitted with the application by Indaver is inadequate and fails to comply with the mandatory requirements as to its

content, contrary to the provisions of the 1999 European Communities (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations” ...and..... “The proposed development would also be contrary to national policy in relation to hazardous waste management and disposal” these are not my words but those of Mr Philip Jones, Senior Planning Inspector for An Bord Pleanala.

The World Health Organisation publication “*Site selection for new hazardous waste management facilities*” has often been used by Indaver particularly in its Environmental Impact Statement. I would like to quote from the W.H.O.’s own summary of this document;

This publication outlines the processes involved in selecting appropriate sites where new facilities can be set up to manage hazardous waste. It advocates using a voluntary process that relies on public support and acceptance of the need for such a facility.....

A little bit lacking in this case I think.

The National Maritime College of Ireland.

This state of the art multi million euro college will be teaching over 700 students from all over Ireland and beyond per annum and employing over 70 staff. This ultra modern facility will reinforce Ireland’s position as a centre of excellence in maritime training. It will have the harbour on its northern border and the huge site with the toxic waste incinerator right across the road on its southern boundary. From computer data and models, according to the Indaver’s

data, the maximum concentration of emission from the plant is at 'the site's boundary' and 'the immediate boundaries of the site'. (page 27 EIS)

This means that this third level college will be most vulnerable of any building in Ireland. How can this be allowed? The W.H.O. criteria talk about a site of a hazardous waste incinerator having no more than 15 dwellings within 150m. (para 5.1 p 7 Response to 3rd Party Appeals to an Bord Pleanála)

Although I have yet to confirm what the W.H.O. definition of what a 'dwelling' is, I would bet that a large college of 700+ people within 20 meters of its entrance.... way, way exceeds this criteria.

I only hope that the college being so close to the toxic waste incinerator will be seen as a major reason that it will have its draft licence withdrawn. How can a toxic producing plant be at a third level college's front entrance?

The new Maritime College will be promoted worldwide. And so unfortunately would the decision, if it is allowed to go ahead, of building a toxic waste incinerator right on its door step..... having visited the proposed site I'm sure the chair person must have seen this for himself.

Residue.

For every tonne of incinerated toxic waste there will be 30% by weight of waste that has tried to be burnt remaining

in the system. This waste ash contains highly toxic chemicals. Indaver's suggests that it could export it to Germany and Antwerp. But more worryingly is the provision of a hazardous waste landfill in Ireland to receive this waste, and I'm sure it is not going to be a million miles away from Ringaskiddy. (para 9.4 p 13 Response to 3rd Party Appeals to an Bord Pleanála)

The EPA is helping to create a deadly legacy for future generations by allowing the construction of this huge toxic complex on the shores of the harbour in Cork.

Conclusion:

The residents of Cork harbour and its environs are passionate about their harbour and rightly so. I have been to many many harbours around the world and Cork is most defiantly unique and has to be preserved. To pollute the air and the shores with a toxic waste incinerator is nothing short of scandalous.

Question:

Would the Directors of the EPA allow their family and children to co-exist with a toxic waste incinerator? Some how I don't think that they would.

Thank you