

**Submission against the MRF Ipswich Street Fyshwick  
NI201700053**

[EPDCustomerServices@act.gov.au](mailto:EPDCustomerServices@act.gov.au)

To the Director-General of ACT Planning

We do not need this development and certainly not at Fyshwick.

The issue of Justifiable Need has not been convincingly dealt with in the EIS for the Materials Recovery Facility at Fyshwick. Apart from the obvious point that Fyshwick is most unsuitable for that kind of activity, the EIS has failed to convince that there is any beneficial purpose for this development at this site.

Indeed, I can see no Public benefit in it all. All the benefits will go to the developer since his metal recycling business will be able to transport by rail directly to Port Botany.

This is supposed to be a solution to a waste problem which the EIS has failed to prove exists. Contrary to its claims Mugga Lane does not have a short life span having recently been granted a 30 year extension. The methane collection system at Mugga is as good as the one at Woodlawn capturing 67% of the methane. Shipping all of Canberra's red bin waste to Woodlawn and much of the C&I waste too, pre-empts any community endorsed outcomes of the Waste Feasibility Study and undermines the present and future efforts of Canberra residents' efforts at recycling. We are good recyclers compared to other cities and we have many successful recycling businesses in the ACT already. The FOGO experiments with a third bin needs time to establish itself and be evaluated. Depending on Woodlawn to accept our waste for a long period of time creates a risk which we should not have to face. Woodlawn does not at present have consent to take this volume of waste by rail except from Sydney. There were no contingency plans in the EIS for the event that Woodlawn would be no longer able to receive it. All these are good reasons why we do not need this facility at this time and why it should be rejected.

This development does nothing to reduce landfill as a waste disposal option. It merely transfers the problems from one landfill Mugga Lane, to another, Woodlawn in NSW. Where is the benefit to the residents of NSW in reducing the life of Woodlawn by taking 300,000tpa of ACT waste?

The purpose of the EIS is to determine if the merits of this proposal to the ACT community outweigh its obvious dangers. If one considers the proposal when fully developed with a WtE facility the conclusion is reached that it obviously does not.

This is not an issue which the proponent should be asked objectively to assess. It is an issue along with many other important ones raised by this development which only independent experts should be asked to address. I therefore ask the Minister to consider setting up an Inquiry Panel of suitably qualified scientists and economists to assess this proposal and to allow the community to have further say in its waste management strategies.

Yours faithfully,

