

To whom it may concern;

I have recently purchased a condo approximately 1 mile from the proposed site. If I had known that the proposal to have the MedRecycler pyrolysis processing plant so close to the condo had even progressed to DEM approval, I would have seriously reconsidered purchasing property in the area. I probably would not have purchased the property.

My concerns are related to risks to the health and well-being of the people in the area, risks to people and the environment associated to the lack of proven safety for the medical waste processing to be included and the apparent lack of mitigations/resolutions/support in place to handle the risks associated to having this proposed site and of course, the resulting possibility of decreasing property values (which will probably negatively impact taxes to the towns).

- I am also concerned that, according to their annual report, the company providing the technology is not financially stable enough to pay their bills making continued support for the processing questionable. Where will support come from if the company goes under? Please review the financial stability of the South African company that will be supplying the equipment for this process. DEM and other committees/departments/councils involved with approving this proposal should also provide confirmation on the financial stability of the company.
- Also, given their financial instability, I do not agree with Rhode Island backing a bond for \$17,200,000 for the financial support needed for MedRecycler given the associated concerns. Note: Rhode Island does not need another '38 Studios'.
- What evidence is there that Pyrolysis facilities are making the profits to support the tax benefit supporters and owners say will be provided?

THE PROPOSAL HAS BEEN ACTIVE SINCE 2019. WHY WAS IT NOT PUBLICIZED UNTIL THIS YEAR?

- I have spoken to a number of the people in this area and very few were aware that such a facility was even under consideration so near to our community.
- If this process is so safe and would be such a good neighbor as Mr. Campanella stated, why has it not been publicized until recently?
- If this process is so safe, why are there so few active implementations in the US given that the process has been available for over a decade?

PROCESS IS NOT FULLY TESTED FOR MEDICAL WASTE – NO OTHER FACILITY USING PYROLYSIS IS PROCESSING SIMILAR MEDICAL WASTE SO THE PROCESS COULD NOT BE TESTED.

- From what I have read, my understanding is that the pyrolysis process has not been fully tested with the types of medical waste that are targeted for the West Warwick facility. If that is correct, I don't think we should approve the proposed establishment of this untested process in Rhode Island or any populated area.
- From what I understand, the Pyrolysis process has been available for waste recycling such as burning wood and plastics for over a decade. If the process is so safe, why are there so few locations currently active/running? Please also review the financial stability of the South African company that will be supplying the equipment for this process. DEM and other committees/departments/councils involved with approving this proposal should also provide confirmation on the financial stability of the company.

- I would think that the risks to health and wellness should be known and mitigated or resolved before the permits are even reviewed; never mind approved.

#### MITIGATION PROCEDURES ARE TO BE IDENTIFIED AND PUT IN PLACE AFTER PROCESS IS IN PLACE?

- It is my understanding that the company is proposing to address the mitigation and/or resolution of health and safety risks AFTER the process is up and running. I would have thought that the company should be presenting risks with clear/comprehensive mitigations/resolutions as part of the permitting and review process and before any approvals are received. How and why is this company allowed to bypass establishment of these procedures before DEM review and approval process or any other approval process?

#### NO BUFFER AREA AROUND THE PROPOSED FACILITY AS REQUIRED

- From what I have heard, there is legally supposed to be a buffer area around such a facility to lessen the risk of any negative impacts. There is no buffer with the location of the facility which will be in an industrial park, near a child day care center, across from the New England Tech school, among many residences and very near wetlands behind the facility. How are we protected? Words from Mr. Campanella that the facility will be safe and a 'good neighbor' do not seem to be sufficient.

#### REVIEW AND APPROVAL PROCESS NOT BEING FOLLOWED BY THE COMPANY OWNERS AND SUPPORTERS

- It is my understanding from the March 15<sup>th</sup> DEM ZOOM meeting that required procedures are not being followed and required approvals have not been received to support the DEM review/approval process. If the owners/beneficiaries of this proposal are not following legal requirements in the approval process, how can we trust that they would follow procedures to do what they say they will do post implementation? Why are they trying to force this thru?

Please do not allow this Pyrolysis facility to be approved for Rhode Island. Please keep your focus on protecting the environment and Rhode Islander's safety and well-being over the possibility of 30 new jobs and questionable tax receipts.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter,

Nancy Nordquist

175 Pine Glen Drive

East Greenwich, RI 02818