

# Proposed risk assessment methodology for hazardous substances

## Submission Reference no: 6

Bunty Condon, **But'n'Benbrae Ltd (Sandra Jane Condon)**

71 Oraha Rd, Kumeu

Auckland, 0892

New Zealand

buntycondon@xtra.co.nz

**Submitter Type:** Not specified

**Source:** Web Form

### Overall Notes:

#### Clause

1. Is the level of detail appropriate? (please reference page numbers as appropriate)

#### Position

No

#### Notes

#### Clause

2. Are there any areas that you would like more information on? (please reference page numbers as appropriate)

#### Position

Yes

#### Notes

Risks to humans, unborn foetus, toxic to flora, length of time toxic in water, how toxic?

#### Clause

3. Is the level of detail appropriate? (please reference page numbers as appropriate)

#### Position

No

#### Notes

Inadequate science.

#### Clause

4. Are the technical aspects correct? (please reference page numbers as appropriate)

#### Notes

Dubious

#### Clause

5. Are there any areas that need more guidance? (please reference page numbers as appropriate)

#### Position

Yes

#### Notes

Toxic harm to people. See above and below.

#### Clause

6. Are there any other matters that should be addressed as part of this methodology? (please reference page numbers as appropriate)

#### Position

Yes

#### Notes

Need more thorough and complete scientific thorough tests and answers.

#### Clause

8. Is the level of detail appropriate? (please reference page numbers as appropriate)

#### Position

No

**Notes**

What about toxic water on house roofs contaminating drinking water? Also toxic contamination of drinking water for all animals, wild, farming and domestic.

**Clause**

9. Are the technical aspects correct? (please reference page numbers as appropriate)

**Notes**

Don't know. Dubious

**Clause**

10. Are the requirements practical and achievable? (please reference page numbers as appropriate)

**Position**

No

**Notes**

Please note: Cats are NOT pests. We rely on you to take care of our environment and the ecology. Do not allow people to use poison! Too risky. People are idiots. Causes way too much suffering. Kids and other beloved pets are at huge risk of being poisoned. Also native birds.

**Clause**

11. When used in conjunction with the external guidelines for each model, is any further clarification required to be able to perform a risk assessment? (please reference page numbers as appropriate)

**Position**

Yes

**Notes**

Unborn foetus, affect on human heart. Degree of suffering caused to animals... is this acceptable? No suffering is acceptable.

**Clause**

12. Are the parameter values used by the EPA relevant and correct? (please reference page numbers as appropriate)

**Position**

No

**Notes**

Cannot believe anything that DoC or Landcare Research claim, so how can anyone believe EPA. Auckland Council gives no reason to believe or trust them either.

**Clause**

13. Are the models used by the EPA relevant and correct? (please reference page numbers as appropriate)

**Position**

No

**Notes**

Inadequate

**Clause**

14. Are there any alternate models that the EPA could consider? (please reference page numbers as appropriate)

**Position**

Yes

**Notes****Clause**

7. Are there alternative groundwater models that the EPA could consider as part of a revised groundwater risk assessment framework?

**Notes**

Undoubtedly

**Clause**

I would like my personal information (other than my name) to be withheld from any publicly available response documents.

**Position**

No

**Notes**