Attachment 3 to Report 99.618 Page 1 of 2



Wellington

13 October 1999

Mr Stuart Macaskill Chairman Wellington Regional Council PO Box 11-646 WEI1_INGTON

Dear Stuart

MEDICAL WASTE (WELLINGTON) LIMITED

Thank you for taking the time to talk with us, and further to my earlier memo dated 8 October 1999, T would like to add further comments made by my fellow Director, Bernie Knowles.

We appreciate that the **port's** ownership of 50% of Medical Waste (Wellington) Limited bring you into the "firing tine" when **the** issue is raised. However, our partners are a major Australasian company with **real** expertise in **these** matters and we believe we can add an influence which is totally in accord with the environmental **expectations** of your Council.

The location of the incinerator has an historical basis. Early MAF requirements were that ship wastes should not be carried over land and the site was about the only place, other than Seaview, where rubbish could be **delivered** by sea. At that time the area round Burnham Wharf was much more industrially oriented with a major fuel installation, gas works, etc and Maupuia not contemplated.

While the sea delivery is no longer relevant, the amount of airport waste and now hospital waste still makes the site one which would be entirely suitable **IF** there was no perception that incineration was something to be nvoided. Other incineration plants which previously existed in and around Wellington did not have capability of high temperature incineration and have been closed down. MAF and health requirements still demand destruction of organic material and Medical Waste now provide a facility for the whole of the WRC region.

Additionally to quarantine waste and hospital and animal wastes (from Massey University dissections etc) we burn confidential papers. These are largely Government or medical papers together with some tobacco wastes. All of these latter products assist the efficiency of the plant, ie it goes better and cleaner with more product.

ControPort Limited 20 Box 704 Wellington, New Zealand Telephone 164 4 495 3800 Eactionle 164 4 495 3820 www.confreport.co.nz To eliminate smoke completely would require fitting **an after** burner (some \$1,000,000 expenditure) **and** use of much more gas with the increase in CO' which is again undesirable.

It. is unlikely that even a smokeless, dioxin less incinerator would have public approval tut equally we face a real problem in locating any waste disposal unit from public reaction. Work is being carried out in Auckland by our partner on a rotary autoclave basically grinding all waste to small size, autoclaving it to mert biological status and burying it in landfill. If it proves successful this would appear to be the way to go possibly locating it at a landfill site or well out of the way in Waingawa if appropriate resource management consent cen be obtained. Whatever solution is found (including higher temperature incineration if autoclaving is not successful) the present life of the existing plant is limited – probably no more than two years.

Meantime the major issue is smoke and dioxins. Recent improvements to the plant hnvc reduce smoke incidents (it does not produce smoke when running well) but steam condensation is often taken for smoke when there has been evidence of earlier smoke emissions.

As advised dioxins are the result of all burning - barbecues or car exhausts etc and have en unfortunate connotation of being cancer related - notwithstanding that only one of the hundreds of dioxins has been found to be dangerous. Given the dispersion of the emissions by normal Wellington ventilation there is no public health (Mt Victoria tunnel would be likely to be a much greater hazard) hut we recognise perception and publicity create a problem which we must work to eliminate. We can only assure yau that the issue has been before the Medical Waste (Wellington) Limited Board for some 18 months (largely on economic rather than environmental grounds initially) and that the CentrePort Board has been kept fully informed and keeps us both on our toes to find a solution.

We can assure you that the interests of the Regional Council are kept very much to the fore through our participation and respectfully suggest that they are better met by participation in seeking a solution within the Company than might otherwise be the case if the Council's interest in the problem was not so directly linked to CentrePort shareholding.

We would be happy to discuss the concerns of any of the groups that have an interest in this matter and which raise. them in the first instance with your Council. Monitoring of the emissions will continue - albeit that most of the concerns raised with the Council will continue as long as any visible evidence of combustion is noted.

Thank you again for your interest.

Regard

Bernie Knowles and Ken Harris