

Submission from Ms Lyndall McCormack

Before I answer your questions I will just to make you aware I belonged to a group of people who met at the offices of the Nature Conservation Council Of New South Wales for many, many years we were called the Waste Crisis Network then we became the zerowastenetwork and we communicate with each other through the zerowastenetwork yahoo group site and we also have an OzRefunds Yahoo group site we did want zero waste to landfill in NSW by 2010 and we wanted putrescibles banned from Landfill and we would like action plans to be taken notice of ,like the NSW government's Green Waste Action Plan and any other action plans associated with waste. It may be you may need to write National Action Plans. I would also say that I would want all hazardous waste banned from landfill and all plastics banned from Landfill (polystyrene Styrofoam, plastic bottles plastic nappies, etc) even aluminium tins, steel ,leather wood all metals, tyres and paper and any rubber material which takes too long to break down and all e-waste should be banned and because of the intergenerational equity principle and intra generational equity principle , leaving it for other generations to deal with the problem and that isn't considered sustainable .I support container deposits as part of an Extended Producer Responsibility system and so to does the Nature Conservation Council who want a national container deposit system. I always thought we needed local sustainability groups to carry out education and programs so that we could go into sustainable economic growth and show others how it could happen for poor income families. We need to also map our residual resources nationally and make great awareness of how to avoid landfilling waste and we need to know the environmental value of Australia providing resource efficiency

http://nccnsw.org.au/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=2778&Itemid=1

I think you need to take a holistic approach to manage the problem. I would have liked to have known how much leachate was produced in Australia. I have read somewhere that for every ton of rubbish there would be 150 litres of leachate and I would have liked that confirmed through a citation in your report but I have not seen it however it may be written in I don't know. Segregation of waste to divert it from landfill and the reduction of waste would help Australia have less land put aside for landfill which is polluting and produces methane a 20 to 26 times more potent greenhouse gas. In Australia we need to design out waste as a before pipe solution so a product is originally designed to close the loop and we need to

conduct materials flow analysis on incinerators and concrete plants etc, all projects and we need to look at waste in an integrated manner

I am a member of the Alternative Technology Association. I also belong to the zerowastenetwork yahoo group and the ban toxics yahoo group. I and my other members probably consider ourselves as volunteers and I do this submission just as a member of the community an individual. I will write my comments in 12 pica Ariel and I just have not got the time nor the skills to write a professional report. So I am just giving this a bit of a go. If you can't understand what I am trying to get at then just ask me via an email or on the telephone or by letter.

Thank you so much for sharing your information with us via your consultation paper.

- 1) Are there opportunities to further co-ordinate, harmonize and streamline approaches to waste management across jurisdictions Yes because you have said in your consultation report there is a lack of data we need to have a national waste data base and the measurement would have to be harmonized across Australia but does not this Australian waste data base exist still <http://www.csiro.au/science/AustralianWasteDatabase.html>.**

Also you mention that because of the introduction of the CPRS methane emissions meaning the measurement of that would have to be harmonized and the measurement of residual resource recovery and the harmonization of being able to map the residual resource to also harmonize hazardous waste collection and management and product stewardship including extended producer responsibility schemes All targets should reflect the fact nationally that we have Zero Waste Australia and we should be heading towards that goal and have a zero waste framework so harmonise the goals and targets towards zero methane production towards zero carbon , it is a visionary goal. I do hope I have the right idea about what harmonisation actually means. You do say in your consultation paper page 12 that “the materials and processes covered by management and resource recovery policy vary from jurisdiction to jurisdiction and I say taking all of the materials and processes we have in all states now, include all of them and harmonise it with any new editions that arise from this consultation, all states should do the same unless some states see them selves as having a special circumstance that doesn't happen any where else.. The waste hierarchy as was shown to me in our Sydney public forum showed us the waste hierarchy and an it should be the same as the one you have mentioned in all states with waste avoidance at the top and so should we take notice of the CPRS hierarchy, both of them in all states

should be used. There should be harmonized bans in landfills to ban the items I have mentioned previously like plastics nappies polystyrene, Styrofoam wood , tyres , e-waste, leather hazardous waste now batteries untreated clinical waste all those materials that would be banned in South Australia and paint it should be the same across all states Also the Stockholm convention people have just said they may list new chemicals and you should harmonise that you can find the information at this web link under chemicals and waste <http://www.iisd.ca/mea-l/meabulletin69.pdf>

commercial pentabromodiphenyl ether (c-pentaBDE), chlordecone, hexabromobiphenyl (HBB), lindane, perfluorooctane sulfonate (PFOS), alpha hexachlorocyclohexane (alphaHCH), beta hexachlorocyclohexane (betaHCH), pentachlorobenzene (PeCB) and commercial octabromodiphenyl ether (c-octaBDE).

I have heard that the UN want to ban DDT by listening to the ABC radio talking to Jeff Angel of the Total Environment Centre and there is a UN Mercury document requiring us to do something about the release of mercury which we should do. If you ask them they may say they have found alternatives on a DDT use and ways to do that. They may not have to spray DDT to get rid of malaria if that is why they use it. Can you also do something about dry cleaning chemicals

- 2) Does categorisation mean as in this paper http://www.ec.gc.ca/substances/ese/eng/challenge/batch3/batch3_111-77-3_rm.cfm “Categorization involves identifying those substances on the DSL that a) are considered to be persistent (P) and/or bioaccumulative (B), based on the criteria set out in the *Persistence and Bioaccumulation Regulations*, and “inherently toxic” (iT) to humans or other organisms; or b) present, to individuals in Canada”

We need then a *Persistence and Bioaccumulation Regulation showing whats toxic to humans in Australia. The fact sheets in the National Pollutant industry may only show what causes cancer not just what is poison to people lam not sure. Because I have also read this paper <http://www.environmentalpaper.com/documents/StateOfPaperIndSm.pdf> Its says “The climate change effects of paper carry all the way through to disposal. If paper is landfilled rather than recycled, it decomposes and produces methane, a greenhouse gas with 23 times the heat-trapping power of carbon dioxide. More than one-third of municipal solid waste is paper, and municipal landfills account for 34 percent of human related methane emissions to the*

atmosphere”maybe we should have standards to make sure peutrescibles are banned from landfill.

It is also clear that we need to have standards for what happens when smoke detectors in houses get thrown out or recycled as they have radioactive waste in them. You could get the international Institute of Sustainable Development to go into partnership with the ANU and the CSIRO to set up a system between governments so progress is made to help them work together sustainably. My group finds that governments have intent to do things but progress is slow to happen so governments should work together to look at a model so they can work sustainably together to achieve things as quickly as they can on categorisation and standards and guidelines even and regulations. While one federal government loses power and another side comes into power we need a system organised so that issues don't stall and innovations can carry on and that all should be built into this partnership project The Waste sector may also need to think about biodiversity offsets and standards guidelines etc <http://www.cbd.int/doc/meetings/cop/cop-09/information/cop-09-inf-29-en.pdf>

I am finding this submission hard going so I will leave you with this piece of information a bit of an innovation from the CSIRO I believe and a few web links that may help. Can you consider and compare and contrast all the information I am showing you here.

http://www.unido.org/fileadmin/ext_media/Services/Environmental_Management/CP_ToolKit_english/CP_introduction/PR-Introduction-Heft1_8-d-4.pdf

CSIRO and VR TEK collaborate to improve waste rubber recycling

30 April 2009

[CSIRO](#) says it is working with [VR TEK Operations](#) to design and develop an improved waste rubber recycling method.

According to CSIRO, the new rubber recycling method could see discarded rubber tyres used to make new tyres, industrial insulation, road pavement, flooring or geotextiles for retaining walls and embankments.

Most of the one billion tyres discarded globally per year end up in landfill, because they are almost impossible to recycle economically. The tyres cannot be burned, due to the health and environmental hazards that produces.

The collaborative Advanced Manufacturing Cooperative Research Centre project will develop new technologies to reduce waste tyres to devulcanised and activated high quality rubber powders.

The rubber powders can then be used to manufacture new rubber products. VR TEK supplied designs for a cutting mechanism, which succeeded in segmenting a tyre into specific pieces.

Following the segmentation, the project will devulcanise and activate the rubber to produce high quality rubber powders. These stages will begin soon.

<http://en.cop15.dk/blogs/view+blog?blogid=1102>

http://www.epa.gov/oswer/iwg/pilots/innovation_pilots_waste.htm

<http://www.igpress.com/archives/free/001821.html>

<http://www.environment.nsw.gov.au/warr/WARRStrategy2007.htm>

<http://www.mathandling.com.au/Article/CSIRO-and-VR-TEK-collaborate-to-improve-waste-rubber-recycling/479316.aspx>

<http://www.zerowaste.co.nz/default,286.sm>

http://www.env.go.jp/en/headline/file_view.php?serial=174&hou_id=568

http://www.env.go.jp/en/headline/file_view.php?serial=174&hou_id=568

http://www.iea.org/Textbase/papers/2008/Competitiveness_and_Carbon_Leakage.pdf

http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/bud_bud09_landfilltax.htm

http://www.opsi.gov.uk/si/si2009/em/uksiem_20090890_en.pdf

<http://www.zerowasteaustralia.org/>

<http://www.environment.nsw.gov.au/waste/drycleaningwaste.htm>