

My name is Audrey Hogan. I am an elected member of the Ringaskiddy & District Residents Association. I fulfill the role as secretary within the organisation. We would have in our organisation members not only from Ringaskiddy but also from Shanbally, Cool more, Raheens, Curraghbinny, Raffeen as well as Raffeen Hill. We would have in excess of 1,000 people living within the catchment area. I also sit as one of community representatives on the Industry Residents Liaison group. I was born in Ringaskiddy and I still live in the area. There are 3 generations of my family living in the Ringaskiddy area. Many of the people I would represent are not here today for many different reasons.

Some because they cannot physically get here. Other because of work and family commitments. The rest would fall into 3 categories.

1. The worry category: The worry that this proposal will be given the green light and that we as a community will have to put our lives on hold again as we go from here back to the high court, the Supreme Court and on to the European Court of Justice. That there will be another 8 or 9 years spent away from their families.
2. The fear category: The fear that this will be given the green light and that we as a community will have to fight again as we did in the 70's when we the people of Ringaskiddy saw their village turned into a battle field when we tried to stop Raybestoes Manhattan creating an asbestos dump within our midst. When we stood up for our rights at that time, we were battered and bullied by the forces of the state. The children of the seventies and that fight are now the adults of Ringaskiddy and they still remember the fear that was experienced at the time.
3. The going through the motions category: That we are just going through the motions. This is how some people in my area see this hearing. The applicant applied to Cork County Council was rejected. They then went to An Bord Pleanala and put a community through an oral hearing that is now seen by some as the trial run. They are now rolling out Doctors from a Limited company. A member of Pharma Chem and a well-oiled P R machine to see if they can't fix what they missed last time. They see this as a game and whether they participate or not they feel the outcome is already determined.

We have on one side the applicant. With access to immeasurable funds and as we know from experience very deep pockets. We have the good people of CHASE and others who have been opposed to these incinerators from the start. People that have stuck with this campaign over the last 8 years a group of people not unlike the Ringaskiddy Residents Association who have been fund raising for a long time to stop this incinerators from being located within our harbour. As I sit here today I have to ask where the parity is? This is very much a David and Goliath situation.

Ringaskiddy is a rural community that has in its environs many types of industrial facilities, not all of them are of the pharmaceutical type. We also have a third level college. The Maritime College of Ireland, the only one of its kind in the country. We

also have the headquarters of the Irish Naval Service. I get very angry when I hear so called planning experts tell inspectors at oral hearings that the people of Ringaskiddy are of no consequence as Cork County Council has no projected population figures for the area. We in Ringaskiddy are a living and thriving community. At previous oral hearings and again at this one the information put in the public domain by the applicant seems to be of one giving the impression that Ringaskiddy is a dying community. While we do have an active retired club, which recently held a fundraiser to help pay for the costs we are incurring at this hearing.

We also have the following very active clubs in Ringaskiddy. A karate club, a youth club, a soccer club, a hurling and football club we also have an award winning drama group. We have the Ringaskiddy youth festival where competitors come from all over the county and this is now in its 40th year. This is run by members of the local community. We have 2 primary schools as well as two Montessori schools.

There might not be big plans for housing in the County development Plan for Ringaskiddy but in our current economic environment the same can be said for any part of the county. We are still building one off houses. The house that my grandfather would have lived in was knocked recently and replaced by 4 houses, 3 of which are occupied by families with young children. There is an area in the village known as Rose Lodge, which has recently been given the green light by An Bord Pleanála for housing.

We are currently in the process of putting together a committee to fund raise for a playground. Cork County Council has given us a grant of €40,000 towards it

Can you imagine what kind of a playground we would have if we did not have to spend our time and our energy trying to keep these Belgian Invaders out of our community?

This applicant has been trying to buy themselves into Ringaskiddy for the past 8 years and more and they have failed to do so.

I want to recall a conversation that Mr. Ahern had with one of my neighbours back in the day when he said what would win the day for him was Apathy. Apathy as described in the dictionary is lack of interest or lack of enthusiasm. Can I make it clear that there is no apathy here, just because people are not present does not mean they do not care.

In 1950, the US novelist John Dos Passos wrote "apathy is one of the characteristic responses of any living organism when it is subjected to stimuli too intense or too complicated to cope with. The cure for apathy is comprehension." I would like the applicant to note that the people of the lower harbour have yet to suffer from an outbreak of apathy. But no doubt if they did, the applicant would find a way to incinerate the cause of it.

But instead we as a community made it our business to comprehend what it is they want to do to us.

Look at the amount of money the applicant has spent over the past 8 years trying to get these incinerators built. The question that should be asked is why? The answer is simple and can be answered in 2 words CASH COW.

In business, a cash cow is a product or a business unit that generates unusually high profit margins: so high that it is responsible for a large amount of a company's operating profit. If these incinerators are given planning permission it will create a monopoly.

A monopoly to my understanding is anti competitive.

It would lead to exclusive dealing.

Exclusive dealing refers to when a retailer or wholesaler is 'tied' to a company. Exclusive dealing is illegal due to the Restrictive Trade Practices Act.

There would also be barriers to entry.

We have a limited supply of waste so this monopoly would be designed to avoid the competition that new entrants would bring.

The amount of jobs that this company has the potential to bring is insignificant when compared to the amount of potential damage that it has the capacity to do to the health of our community. Time and time again they have been asked about indemnity. They have refused to even consider it. The truth of the matter is that there are more jobs created in the recycling industry than there are in the mass burn of our resources. We have industry in Ringaskiddy that does use incineration as part of their waste strategy. They incinerate some waste on site and if this is not possible, it is sent abroad for recovery or disposal. Much of the waste that used to come off site no longer does so, as the cost of raw material is so expensive that there is a policy to recover and reuse where ever it is possible. We hear how the applicant is going to source his waste in Ringaskiddy. As it currently stands he does not have any contracts with any of the chemical industries in Ringaskiddy. At the last meeting of the Industry Residents Liaison group that was confirmed.

What we should remember is that waste is a commodity that can be bought and sold on the open market and it is my understanding that there is currently excess capacity in Europe, and that there are many companies there only too willing to burn it for profit. It is also my understating that Europe does not require Ireland to built incinerators when our volume of waste is so low.

It is not true to say that if we export our waste that we will be exporting our jobs.

Industry came to Ireland in the 70's because we were a low based economy. We are now attracting new types of industry, the biotechnology type. They came because we have a well educated and highly skilled workforce. As it stands at the moment we are exporting jobs not because we don't have incineration it's because we are a too high cost based economy.

It should also be remembered that incineration is a dirty industry and we really want that for Cork Harbour.

I have one comment to make about the Pharma Chem Industry they do say on their website that do not support any particular site for a toxic waste incinerator so I find it incredible that the applicant would try to convince this Oral Hearing that they support his application.

I recently attended a lunch at the new Hovione plant in Ringaskiddy this lunch was to celebrate their arrival to Ringaskiddy. This is the company that took over one of the Pfizer plants in the area it was not a matter of concern to them whether we had 1 or 2 incinerators in the country they had other reasons for locating here. As a matter of fact they could not understand how the pharmaceutical companies that are situated in the area actually got planning permission to build in such a beautiful harbour. We should now, not add injury to insult and we should not allow these incinerators to be built in beautiful Cork harbour. Ireland along with the rest of the world is currently trying to get rid of their toxic assets, not trying to gain some more.

We have here in Cork City a well known land mark, it is a clock. It is known as the 4 faced liar. It is called this because all of its faces tell a different time, at any one time. At a previous oral hearing we heard from the applicant that his toxic waste incinerator was needed for the country and he was promising us, the people of the lower harbour that he would not import waste. By the end of the hearing he had changed his story it would be something instead for the Island of Ireland. We had gone in a short period of time from something that was to benefit the 26 counties to something that was to benefit all 32. He was just short of wrapping the green flag around himself and giving us a rousing rendition of the national anthem. He then went to an EPA oral hearing and said, well I need a licence for my toxic waste incinerator and while you are at it throw in one for a municipal incinerator even though I don't have any planning permission for one. At a previous oral hearing when asked about the flooding on the site he went on to say the people of Ringaskiddy must have gone down with shovels and dug holes in the ditches so the tidal water could get on to the site.

It now seems because of this new planning application that the people of Ringaskiddy have the potential to burn waste that could come from as far east as Canterbury, as far north as the Orkney Islands and as far south as Lands End courtesy of our good neighbours in the UK.

We have been told by the applicant that his toxic waste incinerator has to be built because there was in place a European Union Directive that requires us to do so. It is my understanding that a directive is a legislative act of the European Union which requires member states to achieve a particular result without dictating the means of achieving that

result. Directives normally leave member states with a certain amount of leeway as to the exact rules to be adopted.

There is a right of way from the Martello Tower to Gobby. It has existed for hundreds of years. It is still in existence today as I can not recall Cork County Council ever setting in motion any plans to have it extinguished.

The Martello Tower at Ringaskiddy is a registered protected structure and as such has to have its views and settings protected. There is a legal obligation to prevent any protected structure from being damaged. The Martello Tower in Ringaskiddy was besieged in 1794 by the French and it stood up to the invasion. I fear that in 2009 it will suffer irreparable damage if the Belgians are allowed to invade Ringaskiddy, it will not be able to withstand 4 months of bombardment. There were 5 towers built in the harbour area at the time. But the Ringaskiddy tower is unique in that it is apparently the only one surrounded by a ditch cut into the rock on which it is built. The tower at Ringaskiddy when built was at a height of 47 meters. The flue stack on this proposal is 85meters high almost double.

There is much evidence of costal erosion which can be measured in time. The distance from Cloch an Oir or the Rock of Gold to the cliff face is getting bigger.

On the issue of costal erosion and costal flooding. The coastal flooding assessment study has shown that the Ringaskiddy area has experienced at least 5 significant flood events since 1962 as recorded by the O.P.W. which gives an average of 9.4 years between the flood events. This conforms to the Cork County Council figure of tidal flooding occurring every 10 years. The last flood event occurred in October 2004 when the roads to the Indaver site area were submerged in water. The roads were also covered in mud and boulders which were carried by the tidal waves from the beach in the Gobby area. The roadway was impassible to traffic as a result of this flooding.

The following are the levels of the existing roadway, the proposed transfer station on the Indaver site and the 1 in 200 year flood level for the area.

1. Existing roadway approx: 2.6 M.O.D.
2. Proposed waste transfer station: 4.55 M.O.D.
3. One in 200 year flood level: 4.5 M.O.D.

The proposed waste transfer station was designed to a floor level of 4.5 M.O.D. so as to meet the one in 200 year flood level event as insisted upon by the O.P.W. when new coastal developments are constructed. The effect of the 1 in 200 year storm on the roadway means that the roadway servicing the Indaver site will be under 1.9 meters of water in a storm event which would mean that the site could only be assessed by boats. This scenario cannot be seriously contemplated and is so absurd that it belongs to the world of fantasy and certainly not to the world of proper engineering. The Cork County Council submission acknowledges that the roadway will be inaccessible and this has already occurred during the 1 in 10 year storm event and queries whether a system could be put in place to warn Indaver related trucks that the site was inaccessible.

To summarise the previous points the following are acknowledged facts.

1. The site road will be under 1.9 meters of water in the event of a 1 in 200 year storm making it completely inaccessible
2. The road will be inaccessible in the event of a storm frequency of 1 in 10 years.

Based on stated facts with regard to the site and its known problems with flooding, it has been suggested that a flood barriers be constructed to the rear of the car park which is a public area and it is implied that the installation of such a barrier would be a simple solution to the flooding of the roadway. This suggestion cannot be taken seriously as the scale of work required, as the sea in a storm situation will spill on to the roadway leading to Haulbowline Island for a length of at least 200 meters and will make its way to the public roadway to the front of the Indaver site. This land adjacent to the road to Haulbowline is in private ownership and may not be available for the carrying out of the sea defense works. It has been acknowledged by Cork County Council that flooding of the roadway could prevent the trucks bound for the Indaver site from assessing the site. It is alarming to think that the issue of emergency vehicles needing to access the Indaver site was not mentioned. It is obvious that these emergency vehicles who would be required to have full time access to a Seveso designated site will not be able to do so because of potential flooding to the access roadway. It should also be noted that the estimate of the road being flooded once every 10 years could prove to be conservative given the new figures that are being quoted for future flooding and storm events which will occur with even greater frequency than are currently prevailing. In determining the suitability of the site from a planning perspective the issue of health and safety must be an integral part of that process and in that respect the public access roadway has been shown to be completely inadequate and unsafe. To grant permission for this facility will compromise the safety of the local community in a major way and based on reasons stated with regard to the flooding issue the only planning decision which would be fair and reasonable would be an outright refusal for the planning application as submitted.

Cork County Council has in place its own waste management policy which does not involve mass burn incineration. What it does say is that the councils plan is guided by two important principles embraced by the European Union.

1. The polluter pays principle which specifies that those who generate waste should be responsible for the management of that waste
2. The proximity principle, which stipulates that waste should be managed as close as possible to where it is generated

On the polluter pays principle the local community even in their wildest dreams could not generate the amount of waste either toxic or non toxic that is required to feed these burners.

On the polluter pays principle it is my understanding that the current minister for the environment John Gormley is about to reverse the decision that Dick Roche made when he was lobbied extensively by vested interests to have it removed.

I read recently in Clonmels weekly newspaper the Nationalist that Tipperary, Waterford, Kilkenny and Carlow County Councils are now looking to Cork for a solution for their waste disposal needs. They say that incineration is not an option for them as they know they will face stiff opposition from local residents living around whatever site is selected in the region.

Cork County Council has a landfill site at Bottle Hill which has a capacity to look after the needs of the municipal waste generated in the Cork area for the next 20 years.

On the question of site selection. Can I state the following if this site was deemed unacceptable by the last senior planning inspector Mr. Philip Jones, who gave an unprecedented 14 reasons as to why one toxic waste incinerator should not be built. My logic tells me that it is certainly now not suitable for 2 incinerators. A municipal one and a toxic one which is now on a bigger scale than the one previously suggested.

There is in existence an agreement between the Government and the IDA which states that there will never be another dump proposed for the Ringaskiddy area. This came into being after the Raybestos Manhattan incident in the 1970's. This proposal is not in keeping with this agreement.

A point I would like to make on neighbours. This Belgian company that wants to come and be my neighbour, this company that wants to come and locate in my neighbour hood and make vast profits, this company holds over the head of the Ringaskiddy and District Residents association along with named individuals the equivalent of the sword of Damocles. We do not know when the sharpened sword hanging directly over our heads by a single horse-hair is going to fall. They are still holding out for costs that were incurred at a Supreme Court hearing. They have it within their power to bankrupt the community among which they want to locate. When costs were awarded against us they went on record as saying they would have to wait for the outcome of this hearing as to whether they would come after us for costs or not. I am not sure if that is called intimidation or blackmail.

People's health must come before profit.

There is a misconception that if you burn something it goes away. That is not true. Breaking things into fine particles has the effect of vastly increasing their surface area and therefore their ability to pollute. We know that dioxins are the most harmful carcinogen known to man. We know that Dioxins are fat soluble. We know that dioxins have a negative impact on the testicles, the ovaries, the pancreas and the adrenal glands. In May 2002 the Lancet published a report that stated that increased exposure to environmental pollutants may slow adolescent sexual development.

This study was carried out in Belgium the home of Indaver and it was based on a group of 200 17 year olds. One group came from a rural background the other from a suburb that had amongst its industry an incinerator.

Also a recent survey from the US showed that women living near roads where there was a lot of traffic had smaller babies than their counterparts living further away. What about the fugitive emissions from the trucks carrying the toxic waste through the villages of Shanbally and Ringaskiddy past 2 Montessori schools, past the primary school at the Shanbally roundabout to arrive at a destination that is within a stone's throw of the Lower Harbour School which is only just over the hill. And what about the fugitive emissions from the trucks carrying the toxic waste back out the same way. We will have trucks with toxic waste going one way and trucks with toxic ash going the other. There is no radial access to this site. We will have trucks carrying toxic loads going in opposite directions through the village of Ringaskiddy.

On that point alone we should ask that the precautionary principle we adopted.

It is also untrue to suggest that food is not produced in Ringaskiddy. I myself this year will produce apples, raspberries, strawberries, tomatoes, peas and broad beans. Many of my neighbours will do like wise. They will also produce potatoes, rhubarb, corn, gooseberries, blackcurrants etc. and many of us will spend plenty of time in the autumn picking the blackberries that grow wild on the ditches and all of these will be for human consumption. We do have in Ringaskiddy area 2 farmers and a market gardener who produces organic food and I would assume that these men also produce for human consumption.

We also eat the fish that are caught in the harbour.

The N28 has to be intrinsically linked to this project. The fact of the matter is there is no funding for the N28. The last we heard from the NRA's office here in Cork is that they are waiting to see what the next move from the Port of Cork is going to be. Cork County Council has approved a traffic calming scheme for the village of Ringaskiddy. The problem here is that the road through the village is an NRA road so they have to provide the funding.

We can't get funding for traffic calming for a village a small project in comparison to the funding needed for the whole N28. THERE IS NO MONEY. The road infrastructure is inadequate. I have one comment to make on the using of regional roads to access Ringaskiddy. Anyone living in Douglas that would travel to Ringaskiddy via Raffeen Hill and then through Raffeen Hill should consult Dr. Hogan as they are in dire need of medical attention. I can tell you that the residents of Raffeen village see their village as a rat trap and at times feel under siege when they need to get out and about to do their daily business. It has been suggested that people will come off the N28 and use regional roads. The road that is Raffeen Hill is not a regional road it is a local road L2470. The road that is Raffeen village is a local road L26473. I myself live on a local road. One thing you should know about living on a local road in the Ringaskiddy area is this. You need both sight and sound to get on to the road from your home. You have to position your car carefully make sure the road is clear. You then have to listen and if you can't here another car coming you then put the boot down to get to the other side of the road as fast as you can. I also find it incredible that traffic figures submitted by the applicant did not take into account the ferry traffic or the traffic that regularly has to be Garda escorted out from the village and through the Shanbally roundabout. When this happens traffic is prevented from going near the village of Shanbally has the vehicles sometimes are so big they cannot go around the roundabout they have to go through it. Our school children in Ringaskiddy literally take their lives in their hands when they need to cross the road after a day in secondary school; the bus stop is on the opposite side of the road to their homes.

We do not take any heed of photomontages. You can almost hear a collective sigh when you mention the word photomontages. If you had seen the ones for the Centocor site. It looked like a dot on the horizon. In reality it stands on a hill over looking Ringaskiddy. There is not one place in Ringaskiddy that you can not see this plant from. Are we in Ringaskiddy now been asked to look at Indaver on the other side hemming us in?

We as a community have been asked for and given more than any other community in the country. And now when all we have left is Gobby beach we are being told to shut up accept what the applicant in their arrogance see as the inevitable and that we as a community are told, we should just let them get on with it. Gobby beach is the only place left that the people of Ringaskiddy can go to where they can forget what surrounds them. People go to Gobby to see and hear the sea not to experience the industry that surrounds them on a daily basis.

My father is 73 years old today and I can guarantee you he did this morning what he does every morning he has walked to Gobby beach so that he can be near the sea that he used

see every day when he was a young boy and a young man. The Ringaskiddy area was colonised by early settlers who arrived over 2,000 years ago. Evidence of these settlements still remain. The Normans came in the 12th century. Most of the people made a living from either the sea or the land. The industrial revolution came to Ringaskiddy in 1979. My point is that Ringaskiddy was once next to the sea and it was well known near and far as being a scenic area. The country as a whole seemed to benefit from the industrialisation of Ringaskiddy but as a long time resident and you can't argue the facts Ringaskiddy itself did not benefit. The people of Ringaskiddy want to know why are we being dismissed so lightly. Why do we not get to enjoy the same rights as other communities. Why do we have to fight for everything that other communities are given. What makes us different from other communities that certain elements want to wipe us from the face of the earth.

We ask that when you are considering this planning application that you take into consideration the bigger picture. We do not ask these questions lightly. We have been promised in the past by various industrial developers that wanted to come to Ringaskiddy and be our neighbours that everything would be fine. That the facilities they wanted to build were what they called state of the art. What did we get we got a race track for a road and we got explosions and we got fires. We got the most horrendous smells that we could never have imagined. I don't think there is one person living in Ringaskiddy today that could not readily identify the tracing agent mercaptan.

And when we would not lie down and accept the asbestos dump we had our young and old beaten and thrown up on to ditches.

We as Ringaskiddians are here not because of any state agency or competent authority but in spite of them.

We as a community take risks every day. We take risks in our every day lives driving flying etc. or in the case of many residents in Ringaskiddy crossing the road. These are risks we take by choice. These incinerators will be imposed upon a community that does not want them. We as a community are not willing to take the risks that go with them.

Japan operates the most number of waste incinerators of any country in the world. The country however also has the dubious distinction of having the highest levels of dioxin emissions in the environment. According to independent studies communities living around and downwind of incinerators in Japan have been documented to have higher rates of cancer, birth defects and infant mortality compared to incinerators free areas. This is why the people of Cobh should be worried. The prevailing winds will take emissions from this proposed facility and deposit them in Cobh.

We have in our community asthmatics and cystic fibrosis children whose immune system is compromised at the best of times. The building of these incinerators will compromise them further. These children were not calculated in the MARI man.

There are several reasons for you Madam Inspector to recommend refusal to the board.

- The road infrastructure is inadequate – these incinerators will be situated on a site without radial access at the end of a cul de sac.
- They would be a threat to public safety
- The safety of the students in the Maritime college can not be guaranteed
- Part of the site is prone to severe coastal erosion.
- The historical flooding of the site
- The thermal inversions that occur in Cork Harbour. This site has nothing in common with Cork Airport when it comes to air dispersion.
- The inadequacy of the E.I.S. when it comes to dealing with Bats and the migratory bird population.
- The fact that this site will be a Seveso site.
- We do not know if there emergency plan is adequate.
- There is no public trust or confidence in this company.
- We are being told that we have nothing to worry about from modern incinerators the fact of the matter is that we won't know this for at least another 10 – years. There is not any proper risk assessment when it comes to the interaction between this proposal and that of the local community.
- The W.H.O. guidelines were not adhered to in the site selection process
- The fact that the EPA who will ultimately the competent authority that will have to ensure that they keep within their limits is currently by their own admission underfunded.
- It is contrary to the Cork County Development Plan
- It is contrary to the Local Area Plan
- It is contrary to C.A.S.P.
- It is contrary to Cork County Councils own waste plan
- The fact that Cork Harbour is a special protection area.

This is a Seveso site which will be adjacent to other Seveso sites tiers 1 and 2, the big fear for the local community is the Domino Effect. What happens when something goes wrong? Trust me something always goes wrong.

We as citizens of Ringaskiddy, of the Lower Harbour, of Cork, of Ireland and of Europe also have rights. Do we not have the right to a clean environment? Do we not have the right to a healthy environment? The Aarhus Convention recognises every persons right to a healthy environment as well as his or her duty to protect it. The Aarhus Conventions also seeks to ensure that every individual lives in an environment adequate for his or her health and well-being. This applies not only to those of us living today, but to future generations as well.

Bunreacht Na hÉireann (the Constitution of Ireland) guarantees the citizens of this country personal rights. It shall by its laws protect as best it may from unjust attack and

also uphold the property rights of every citizen. We feel this application is an attack on us as a community as well as on our home.

Eleanor Roosevelt regarded the Universal Declaration as her greatest accomplishment. She said the following

"Where, after all, do universal human rights begin? In small places, close to home - so close and so small that they cannot be seen on any maps of the world. Yet they are the world of the individual person; the neighborhood he lives in; the school or college he attends; the factory, farm, or office where he works. Such are the places where every man, woman, and child seeks equal justice, equal opportunity, equal dignity without discrimination. Unless these rights have meaning there, they have little meaning anywhere. Without concerted citizen action to uphold them close to home, we shall look in vain for progress in the larger world."

Madam Inspector the needs of the people of Ringaskiddy are the same as the needs of other communities. We need clean air and a healthy environment in which we want to raise our families and get on with our lives. We do not want to be seen as a community of no consequence as a community that lives in a sacrifice zone. We as community, we like to live, we like to laugh, we like to love and we just want to get on with our lives. My neighbour Thomas Ahern said last week at this hearing when asked if planning permission is granted what it would do to the local community his answer was R.I.P. It has to be said that he is not alone in that view. This proposal if give planning permission will be the death of a community.

Every one seems to want to quote the World Health Organisation; I will be no different this is my quote and it is The W.H.O. definition of Health. "Health is a state of complete physical, mental and social well-being and not merely the absence of disease of infirmity". This is the preamble to the constitution of the World Health Organisation and this definition has not been amended since 1948. I can tell you this Madame Inspector this applicant has been blight on the community of Ringaskiddy since we first heard of them in February 2001 we are now going into our 9th year in this campaign to stop them from entering Cork Harbour. You have it in your power to put this to an end once and for all. On behalf of the people of Ringaskiddy "We the people" ask that you recommend to the Bord refusal for this planning application. We ask you to give us back our Lives.

On one final note Madam Inspector I would like you to ask the Board this.

When they have come to their final decision that they would let the people know of the decision. That it will not be like the last time when we have to listen to Pat Kenny interviewing Mr. Ahern on the national airwaves.

Thank you Madam Inspector for taking the time to listen.

WHO Guidelines for siting of hazardous waste incinerators

Exclusionary factors in site selection for hazardous waste management facilities

- Unstable or weak soils, such as organic soil, soft clay or clay-sand mixtures, clays that lose strength with compaction, clays with a shrink-swell character, sands subject to subsidence and hydraulic influence, and soils that lose strength with wetting or shock.
- Subsidence owing to solution-prone subsurfaces, subsurface mines (for coal, salt and sulphur) and water, oil or gas withdrawal.
- Saturated soils, as found in coastal or riverine wetlands.
- Groundwater recharge, as in areas with outcrops of aquifers of significant or potential use, considering water availability and regional geology (where an impermeable or retarding layer shields the aquifer from the land surface, a specific site analysis should be conducted).
- Flooding, as in flood plains or hydraulic encroachment, coastal or riverine areas with a history of flooding every 100 years or less, and areas susceptible to stream-channel or storm encroachment (even if not historically subject to flooding).
- Surface water, which precludes sites above an existing reservoir or a location designated as a future reservoir, or above an intake for water used for human or animal consumption or agriculture and within a distance that does not permit response to a spill based on high-flow (most rapid) time of travel.
- Atmospheric conditions, such as inversions or other conditions that would prevent the safe dispersal of an accidental release.
- Major natural hazards, such as volcanic action, seismic disturbance (of at least VII on the modified Mercalli scale) and landslides.
- Natural resources, such as the habitats of endangered species, existing or designated parks, forests and natural or wilderness areas.
- Agricultural or forest land of economic or cultural importance.
- Historic locations or structures, locations of archaeological significance and locations or land revered in various traditions.
- Sensitive installations, such as those storing flammable or explosive materials, and airports.
- Stationary populations, such as those of hospitals and correctional institutions.
- Inequity resulting from an imbalance of unwanted facilities of un-related function or from damage to a distinctive and irreplaceable culture or to people's unique ties to a place



Fact sheet EURO/04/05
Berlin, Copenhagen, Rome, 14 April 2005

Particulate matter air pollution: how it harms health

Definition

Particulate matter (PM) is an air pollutant consisting of a mixture of particles that can be solid, liquid or both, are suspended in the air and represent a complex mixture of organic and inorganic substances. These particles vary in size, composition and origin. Their properties are summarized according to their aerodynamic diameter, called particle size.

- The coarse fraction is called PM₁₀ (particles with an aerodynamic diameter smaller than 10 µm), which may reach the upper part of the airways and lung.
- Smaller or fine particles are called PM_{2.5} (with an aerodynamic diameter smaller than 2.5 µm); these are more dangerous because they penetrate more deeply into the lung and may reach the alveolar region.

The size of the particles also determines the time they spend in the atmosphere. While sedimentation and precipitation removes PM₁₀ from the atmosphere within few hours of emission, PM_{2.5} may remain there for days or even a few weeks. Consequently, these particles can be transported over long distances.

Principal sources

The major PM components are sulfate, nitrates, ammonia, sodium chloride, carbon, mineral dust and water. Particles may be classified as primary or secondary depending on their formation mechanism.

Primary particles are directly emitted into the atmosphere through man-made (anthropogenic) and natural processes. Anthropogenic processes include combustion from car engines (both diesel and petrol); solid-fuel (coal, lignite and biomass) combustion in households; industrial activities (building, mining, manufacturing of cement, ceramic and bricks, and smelting); erosion of the pavement by road traffic and abrasion of brakes and tyres; and work in caves and mines. Secondary particles are formed in the air, usually by chemical reactions of gaseous pollutants, and are products of atmospheric transformation of nitrogen oxides mainly emitted by traffic and some industrial processes, and sulfur dioxide resulting from the combustion of sulfur-containing fuels. Secondary particles are mostly found in the fine PM fraction.

Health hazards

The systematic data assessment completed in 2004 by the WHO European Centre for Environment and Health, Bonn, indicates that:

- PM increases the risk of respiratory death in infants under 1 year, affects the rate of lung function development, aggravates asthma and causes other respiratory symptoms such as cough and bronchitis in children;
- PM_{2.5} seriously affects health, increasing deaths from cardiovascular and respiratory diseases and lung cancer. Increased PM_{2.5} concentrations increase the risk of emergency hospital admissions for cardiovascular and respiratory causes; and
- PM₁₀ affects respiratory morbidity, as indicated by hospital admissions for respiratory illness.

Relation of health effects to PM concentration

In the last decade, studies of the short-term effects of PM, based on association between daily changes in PM₁₀ concentrations and various health outcomes, were conducted in many cities in the WHO European Region, including Erfurt and Cologne in Germany. In general, results indicate that short-term changes in PM₁₀ at all levels lead to short-term changes in acute health effects (Table 1). Effects related to short-term exposure include: inflammatory reactions in the lung, respiratory symptoms, adverse effects on the cardiovascular system and increases in medication use, hospital admissions and mortality.

Table 1. Short-term effects on health from 10-µg/m³ increases in PM₁₀ concentration

Health outcome	Estimated percentage increase in risk per 10 µg/m ³ PM ₁₀ (95% confidence interval)	Estimates available for meta-analysis
All-cause mortality	0.6 (0.4–0.8)	33
Mortality from respiratory diseases	1.3 (0.5–2.0)	18
Mortality from cardiovascular diseases	0.9 (0.5–1.3)	17
Hospital admissions for respiratory disease, people age 65 years and over	0.7 (0.2–1.3)	8
Cough, children aged 5–15 years with chronic symptoms	0.0 (–1.3–1.1)	34
Medication use, children aged 5–15 years with chronic symptoms	0.5 (–1.9–2.9)	31

Source: Anderson HR et al. *Meta-analysis of time series studies and panel studies of particulate matter (PM) and ozone (O₃). Report of a WHO task group*. Copenhagen, WHO Regional Office for Europe, 2004 (<http://www.euro.who.int/document/e82792.pdf>, accessed 8 April 2005).

Because long-term exposure to PM results in a substantial reduction in life expectancy, the long-term effects clearly have greater significance to public health than the short-term effects. PM_{2.5} shows the strongest association with mortality, indicating a 6% increase in the risk of deaths from all causes per 10-µg/m³ increase in long-term PM_{2.5} concentration.¹ The estimated relative risk amounts to 12% for deaths from cardiovascular diseases and 14% for deaths from lung cancer per 10-µg/m³ increase in PM_{2.5}.²

The effects related to long-term exposure include: increases in lower respiratory symptoms and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, reductions in lung function in children and adults, and reduction in life expectancy, due mainly to cardiopulmonary mortality and probably to lung cancer

Studies on large populations show a strong effect of PM_{2.5} on mortality, and have been unable to identify a threshold concentration below which ambient PM has no effect on health: a no-effect level. After a thorough review of recent scientific evidence, a WHO working group therefore concluded that, if there is a threshold for PM, it lies in the lower band of currently observed PM concentrations in the European Region.

Estimated change in health damage due to PM in the EU through implementation of current legislation, 2000–2020

Health end-point	Units (1000s)	2000	2020	Difference
EU				
Mortality – long-term exposure	Life years lost	3001	1900	1101
Mortality – long-term exposure	No. premature deaths	288	208	80
Infant mortality	Cases	0.6	0.3	0.3
Chronic bronchitis	Cases	136	98	37
Respiratory hospital admissions	Cases	51	33	19
Cardiac hospital admissions	Cases	32	20	12
Restricted activity	Days	288 292	170 956	117 336
Respiratory medication use, children	Days	3510	1549	1961
Respiratory medication use, adults	Days	22 990	16 055	6935
Lower respiratory symptoms, children	Days	160 349	68 819	91 529
Lower respiratory symptoms, adults with chronic disease	Days	236 498	159 723	76 773
Germany				
Mortality – long-term exposure	Life years lost	657	413	244
Mortality – long-term exposure	No. premature deaths	65	48	17

¹ Pope AC et al. Lung cancer, cardiopulmonary mortality, and long-term exposure to fine particulate air pollution. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 287:1132–1141 (2002).

² Pope AC et al. Lung cancer, cardiopulmonary mortality, and long-term exposure to fine particulate air pollution. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 287:1132–1141 (2002); and Pope AC et al. Cardiovascular mortality and long-term exposure to particulate matter air pollution. *Circulation*, 109:71–77 (2004).

Infant mortality	Cases	0.09	0.05	0.04
Chronic bronchitis	Cases	31	21	10
Respiratory hospital admissions	Cases	11	7	4
Cardiac hospital admissions	Cases	7	4	3
Restricted activity days	Days	63 832	36 216	27 616
Respiratory medication use, children	Days	781	324	457
Respiratory medication use, adults	Days	5166	3522	1645
Lower respiratory symptoms, children	Days	32 291	13 406	18 884
Lower respiratory symptoms, adults with chronic disease	Days	52 636	34 993	17 644

Source: Pye S, Watkiss P. *CAFE CBA: baseline analysis 2000 to 2020*. Vienna, International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis, 2005 (AEAT/ED51014/Baseline Scenarios; <http://www.iiasa.ac.at/docs/HOTP/Mar05/cale-cba-baseline-results.pdf>, accessed 8 April 2005).

For more technical information contact:

TECHNICAL INFORMATION:

Dr Michal Krzyzanowski
Regional Adviser, Air Quality and Health
WHO European Centre for Environment and Health,
Bonn
WHO Regional Office for Europe
Bundeshaus, Görresstraße 15
D-53113 Bonn, Germany
Tel.: + 49 228 209 4405. Fax: +49 228 209 4201
Email: mkr@ecehbonn.euro.who.int

PRESS INFORMATION:

Ms Liuba Negru
Press and Media Relations Officer
WHO Regional Office for Europe
Scherfigsvej 8, DK-2100 Copenhagen Ø, Denmark
Tel.: +45 39 17 13 44. Fax: +45 39 17 18 80
E-mail: LNE@euro.who.int

Ms Cristiana Salvi
Technical Officer, Communication and Advocacy
WHO European Centre for Environment and Health,
Rome
WHO Regional Office for Europe
Via Francesco Crispi 10, I-00187 Rome, Italy
Tel.: +39 06 4877543. Mobile: +39 348 0192305
Fax: +39 06 4877599
E-mail: csa@ecr.euro.who.int

Accidents and Dioxin Contaminations

Here are accounts of just some accidents at incinerator plants, emission breaches and dioxin scares.

Irish Pork Dioxin Scare - October 2008

Discovery of minute traces of Dioxin in animal feed led to the collapse of the Irish pork industry, costing the country 100s of millions of Euros. The Food Safety Authority says that there is no safe limit of Dioxin in food.

Apex, Carolina - Fire at hazardous waste facility - October 2006

Fire and ensuing explosions at a hazardous waste facility in Carolina result in evacuation of thousands of residents and hospitalisation of scores more. Waste storage permit subsequently suspended.
[CNN](#) [The News & Observer](#)

Dioxin scare - February 2006

China and Taiwan ban pork from three European countries over dioxin scare.
[Channel News Asia](#) [Reuters](#)

Chropyne, Czech Republic - Toxic emissions from fire in hazardous waste incinerator

A major fire at a hazardous waste incinerator started November 14th 2004. People warned to stay inside, if possible, and to keep windows closed, because of escaping toxic gases. A temperature inversion keeps fumes trapped low over town. [Read more](#)

Campana, Argentina & El Dorado, Arkansas - Two incinerator accidents in 7 weeks

Explosion at hazardous waste incinerator (Nov 2004) in Argentina kills one operator and injures five firemen. A fire at a hazardous waste incineration plant in El Dorado, Arkansas (2 Jan, 2005) required evacuation of 1,500 people

[CHASE Press Release](#) [More Information \(Arkansas\)](#) [More Information \(Campana\)](#) [Photos](#)

Gilly-sur-Isère, France - Senior French officials face toxins inquiry

5 French officials (including the local mayor) under formal examination for "poisoning, deliberately endangering the lives of others, involuntary injury and manslaughter" in relation to incinerator emissions. [Read more](#)

Dundee - Incinerator breaches limits 19 times in 2 months

An incinerator at Baldovie in Scotland, which came into operation in 1999, breached its safety limits 18 times between April 20 and May 28, 2001 and has experienced a number of fires. [Read more](#) and [more](#).

Dioxin scare 2004

More than 160 farms closed in the Netherlands and Belgium after dioxin found in dairy products. [Read more](#)

Belgian dioxin scare 1999

The Belgium 'dioxin crisis' of 1999 provides a salutary lesson. The Belgian food industry was badly damaged when high levels of dioxin were discovered in eggs and chickens and traced back to dioxin contaminated animal feed. Import bans by countries worldwide included chicken, eggs, meat, and any products containing eggs or milk. The Belgian government estimated the cost of the crisis at €465 million.

Naples, Italy - Hundreds of cattle seized after dioxin tests

Police seized hundreds of head of cattle from farms in the southern region of Naples after tests showed abnormally high levels of deadly dioxin in both the animals and the soil. [Read more](#)