Sent: Friday, 2 September 2011 12:43 PM

To: Environment, Agriculture, Resources and Energy Committee

Subject: Waste Reduction and Recycling Bill 2011

1. Whilst I support any initiative to reduce waste and increase recycling, and, in fact, practice many recent initiatives myself, I am concerned that local residents, particularly aged, frail and disabled, may again be a target of increased costs recovery.

- 2. Whilst the objectives specifically refer to industrial waste, construction and demolition waste and regulated waste, I am concerned that at the local tip, residents mentioned in 1. above may have no exemptions.
- 3. How is the Government State and Local going to differentiate between household and industrial waste?
- 4. Here in Redland City, residents have had a recycling impost for such waste deposited at local tips. This had led to an increase in such waste dumped in other areas. How will the Government ensure that household recycling waste is cost neutral to residents, whilst differentiating that level of recycling from industrial waste.
- 5. How will the levy exempt household residents, particularly frail, aged and disabled?
- 6. The Bill also amends other Acts, mostly it would appear the Carbon Farming and Coal Seam Gas recycled water discharge. Is there provision in these amendments to exclude urban, regional and rural household residents from being caught up in these cost-recovery amendments?
- 7. Does the Government have any provision at all in these Bills and Amendments to Bills to reduce the horrendous impost on ordinary households who appear to be carrying a more-than-fair share of cost recoveries. In general, through no direct acton of their own, householders are being forced to bear an increasing share of costs associated with waste management, recycling, the Carbon question, the unknown costs of water quality changes due to coal seam gas mining, and what appears to me an unfair impost of Government expenses in these matters?

