

## **The risks**

There exist two main areas of risk

1) that the pulp mill will perform in the way that so many other ECF mills in the world have performed, despite assurances to the contrary.

The Valdivia Celco mill, which Sweco Pic helped design, cost some one billion U.S. dollars, and produced 850,000 tons of Kraft pulp, was presented to the country as a model enterprise and, according to mill executives, one of the few in the world to have a tertiary treatment system for the effluent disposal. The environmental resolution approving it assured that the emissions of total reduced sulphide – the characteristic “rotten egg” odour of pulp mills – would not be detectable by the human sense of smell. At the most they would be projected no further than 500 metres from the mill.

Following the launch of the Valdivia pulp mill in February 2004, people in towns within 30 km of the mill sought medical assistance due to headaches, nausea and irritated eyes. Schools had to be closed down because the pupils were nauseous, with headaches and vomiting. The sickening smell even reached the city of Valdivia, 50 km away, provoking complaints and protests, eventually leading to the mill being shut down on several occasions, either by court order or by the environmental authorities.

The Tamar mill is reported to use a unique process for producing chlorine dioxide ‘in stream’ that is a difficult reaction to balance and that produces massive amounts of dioxins if it gets out of balance. Mistakes of underestimation of dioxin levels by factors of 1390 have already been made by the proponent who, as novices in the pulp mill business, are not in a position to accurately forecast mill performance.

Furthermore, pollution control is a cost to the operators.

2) That it’s ‘world scale’ resource requirements will prevent other users of forests, water and land from achieving their objectives.

This issue has been left from all consideration but affects farmers, tourism operators, rural centres and fishermen.

## **The imperative for MLCs to vote NO**

1) About 90% of the impacts on industries and communities has neither been assessed nor measured in the ‘fast track’ process.

2) The missing information will prevent regulators from delivering complete regulations; devising risk control methods; or assuring community safety.

Community costings of the resulting problems shows massive economic penalties that could exceed mill benefits by many times.

3) With so much information missing it is not possible for the government to protect our industries and communities.

The legislative Council, as a house of review, should vote no to the mill proposal until complete information about the mill’s impacts is provided, publicised and properly debated.