



## Minutes

<b>Meeting:</b>	Newcastle Community Consultative Committee on the Environment (No 63)	<b>Date:</b>	Monday 16 May 2022
<b>Location:</b>	EPA office, 117 Bull Street, Newcastle West	<b>Time:</b>	5.30pm – 7:30pm
<b>Last Meeting:</b>	Thursday 28 April 2022	<b>Next Meeting:</b>	Monday 15 August 2021
<b>Present:</b>	John Tate – Chairperson Rick Banyard – Community representative Christopher Tola – Community representative Steven Crick – Environmental representative Nathan Robinson – Industry representative Trudie Larnach – Industry representative David Clarke – Council delegate Stephen White – DPE Claire Miles – EPA Gina Bradley – EPA Jason Wall – SafeWork NSW Craig Dalton – NSW Health Philippe Porigneaux – NSW Health Paul McBain – observer Terry McCauley – observer Lyn Kilby – observer Mary Busted – observer		
<b>Apologies:</b>	Keith Craig – Community representative John Formosa – Public Works Advisory (PWA) Karyn Davidson – SafeWork NSW Leah Cook – Industry representative Peter McMurray – Council delegate David Gathercole – EPA Loredana Warren – DPE		

### Agenda items:

#### 1. Introduction

##### 1.1. Acknowledgment of Country

The Chair acknowledged the Awabakal and Worimi people as the traditional owners of the land and paid respects to their Elders past, present and emerging.

##### 1.2. Present and apologies

The Chair welcomed the committee and noted the apologies.

### 1.3. Housekeeping and introduction

The Chair explained that the meeting would be split into two parts, with the first part focusing on the Wickham fire response and recovery and the second part focusing on other quarterly business arising.

## 2. Previous Minutes and Outstanding Actions – *out of session meetings*

### 2.1. Review previous minutes

The Chair stated his intentions for resolving the issues with the outstanding meeting minutes. The Terms of Reference was referenced at item 12 “*A discussion supported by a majority of the votes cast at a meeting at which a quorum is present is a decision of the Committee*”.

Mr Banyard requested that the meeting be recorded to assist with taking the minutes. The request was declined based on the limited technology capability in the room, but the Chair agreed for anyone to informally record the meeting using their own device. The Chair then called for a motion in relation to each of the outstanding meeting minutes as follows:

#### Previous minutes 7 March 2022

- Mr Clarke moved a motion to accept the draft minutes with the updated annotations and addendum, as circulated by Ms Bradley on Wednesday 11 May. Mr Crick seconded the motion.
- Mr Banyard objected and does not accept the minutes as a true and accurate reflection of the meeting.
- The Chair supported the motion. The minutes were adopted with a majority vote from Ms Larnach, Mr Clarke, Mr Crick and Mr Tola. The minutes will be published online with the addendum in accordance with committee procedures.

#### Previous minutes 7 April 2022

- Mr Banyard moved a motion to accept the draft minutes with all tracked changes incorporated, as circulated by Ms Bradley on Wednesday 11 May. Mr McBain seconded the motion. The minutes were endorsed with no objections.

#### Previous minutes 28 April 2022

- Mr Banyard requested that the draft minutes reflect his changes, provided to Ms Bradley on 15 May. The meeting was paused whilst Ms Bradley provided attendees with a copy of the requested changes.
- Mr Banyard moved a motion to accept the draft minutes, as circulated by Ms Bradley during the meeting.
- Mr Clarke seconded the motion, with two exceptions. First, the additional wording by Mr Banyard under 2.1 that “*the issue was not raised therefore by consensus the minutes were adopted*” was not accepted. Second, the deletion of the wording by Mr Banyard under 2.2 “*there were no outstanding action items*” was not accepted.
- The foreshadowed motion from Mr Clarke was seconded by Mr McBain, with the additional exception of a typo, which should read at 2.1, “a *true and accurate record*”.
- Mr Banyard objected to Mr Clarke’s second exception and requested again that the sentence under 2.2 “*there were no outstanding action items*” be deleted. Mr Banyard does not accept the minutes as a true and accurate reflection of the meeting This objection was not supported.
- The Chair supported the motion with Mr Clarke and Mr McBain’s exceptions. The minutes were endorsed with a majority vote from Mr McBain, Mr Clarke, Mr Wall, Mr Porigneaux, Dr Dalton and Ms Busted.

It was highlighted by Ms Kilby and Mr McBain that the wording endorsed in the minutes of 28 April now contradicts the changes made to the minutes endorsed from the meeting on 7 April. It is unclear whether there is an outstanding action item for the agencies to provide a written response to the 40 questions previously tabled by the community at **Tab 1** and **Tab 2**.

Mr Banyard moved a motion that the agencies provide written responses to the 40 questions within 14 days and distribute the responses to the community. Mr McBain seconded the motion. Mr Tola

suggested that 14 days might be an ambitious timeframe given the number of agencies involved. Mr Clarke objected to the motion on the basis that all questions are either out of date or have already been responded to. He offered to provide responses to any new, unanswered questions but confirmed that the Local Recovery Committee will not be providing any more updates. It is not an effective use of time to revisit questions from six weeks ago. Ms Miles added that information has already been provided through a number of platforms. The committee has previously been advised that the tabled questions were used to inform the community response.

Mr McCauley suggested tabling responses to the questions by simply referring to the relevant sources of information already available. Mr McBain agreed that some of the questions are out of date but suggested that providing responses would be more efficient than continuing the debate. He highlighted that it is the role of the NCCCE to disseminate information to the broader community. However, Ms Miles reminded the committee that in this emergency context, the provision of information has been significant. As such, information was disseminated through many other platforms to increase reach. This has been coordinated by the Local Recovery Committee.

Ms Kilby acknowledged the role of the community and the NCCCE in driving communications. She specifically acknowledged that the initial public meeting organised by the NSW Police and subsequent community drop in events were all initiated by the local community, including herself. There are elderly members of the community, including Ms Kilby's neighbour, who access information directly from NCCCE community representatives.

Mr Banyard moved an amended motion that the agencies provide written responses to the 40 questions within 14 days and distribute to the NCCCE. The 40 questions relate to questions 2-36 in **Tab 1** and questions 1-5 in **Tab 2**, attached to these meeting minutes. Mr McCauley seconded the motion. The motion was supported by the Chair with a majority vote from Mr Banyard, Mr Tola, Mr Crick, Mr Clarke, Mr Wall, Dr Dalton, Mr Porigneaux, Mr McBain, Mr McCauley, Ms Kilby and Ms Busted. The Chair reminded the committee of the difference between being provided with an answer and agreeing with an answer. The action to provide an answer is formerly recorded below:

Action Item No	Action	Person Responsible
1	Provide written responses to the 40 questions within 14 days (30 May 2022) and distribute to the NCCCE	Local Recovery Committee

## 2.2. Outstanding actions

No.	Outstanding action	Status	Lead
2.2.1	Out of session #3, Action 1: Annotate the draft minutes from 7 March and recirculate to the committee	Complete	Gina Bradley
2.2.2	Out of session #3, Action 2: Update the terminology used to describe air monitoring results	Complete	Local Recovery Committee
2.2.3	Out of session #3, Action 3: Provide an update on the status of the site	See item 3.2 below	SafeWork NSW
2.2.4	Out of session #3, Action 4: Advice on whether or not a long-term study will be carried out	See below	Craig Dalton

In relation to action 4, various options have been discussed offline between Dr Dalton and Mr Banyard. Dr Dalton outlined some of the challenges with determining the best way to capture the data. Legislation prevents access to information maintained in the national register. If a long-term health study was to be done a new register of residents, that would be preserved over decades, would need to be set up. NSW Health does not have a mechanism for this at the moment. It can take four decades to draw any connections with mesothelioma. There are obvious issues around capturing data from people who move in/out of the area.

Mr Wall made noted that the cause of any asbestos related disease detected in the future would not be identifiable.

Ms Kilby asked if a map of the fallout zone could help with this. Mr Clarke noted that this information is not publicly available.

In order to provide any advice for the future, a baseline is needed, beyond the existing cancer registry. Mr Banyard advised there has been discussion of forming a group of experts to better understand what the baseline might look like. Dr Dalton has agreed to meet with the community to discuss the scope of a long-term study. He noted that consideration of health study should be in the context of the expert view that the risk of asbestos related disease was extremely low from the event. The Chair endorsed the basis for this. Any attendees interested in being involved with the discussion group should reach out to Mr Banyard directly.

### **3. Wool Store Fire, Annie St, Wickham**

#### **3.1. Agency update**

Ms Miles gave the following update on the clean-up recovery:

- To date, over 500 residences in total have been assessed, cleaned up and certified.
- Approximately 60 homes remain for assessment and clean up. This number has increased as expected over the last fortnight due to EPA communications advising of the 13 May 2022 deadline for assessment.
- A limited number of residences are to still be assessed. This is largely due to some issues contacting residents in Waratah and Georgetown.
- PWA have approximately 40 assessors and clean up contractors in the field completing the remaining works.
- A cost recovery notice has been drafted which will focus on upholding the polluter pays principle.
- The long-term asbestos monitoring plan is currently being prepared and will focus on capturing changes in environmental conditions.

Mr Clarke added the following:

- Milford Street reopened on 11 May, following clean-up of the Wool Store roofs.
- The unexpected finds protocol is now in place. Asbestos bins will be placed in Islington Park and Waratah Park later this week to assist the community with this protocol.

#### **3.2. Presentation on the clean-up of the site, including Q&A**

Mr Wall gave the following update on the clean-up of the site:

- All demolition debris is being taken to Summerhill Waste Management Centre and treated as asbestos waste – approximately 10,000 tonnes of debris has been removed to date.
- Air monitoring on boundary fencing takes place daily.
- Water sprinklers run intermittently (less so with the rain). There is a balance between having too much water that it becomes too damp to work and having sufficient water to reduce airborne particles.
- Water trucks hose the loading of excavated debris. The community concerns of water being emitted onto roadways may be due to the trucks not being dried before they leave the site, but all water emitted on site is contained and all plant is hosed down before leaving the site.
- The plant operates with recycled air conditioning.
- Workers are all wearing appropriate PPE/RPE and have completed friable asbestos training.
- Daily toolbox talks and air-monitoring results are communicated with the workers and supervision of all controls is in place.
- The completion is estimated at the end of May 2022. This will include soil sampling validation and final LAA clearance certificates being issued. Permanent fencing will be installed along Annie Street to ensure the site is fully fenced on completion.

The following questions and answers were provided:

- Have the reported missing safes been found? They are still being searched for.

- Was anything found above the Limits of Reporting (LORs)? No, exposure monitoring is not a requirement under the legislation. No results is a good result.
- Have any other major contaminants been found onsite? No. Other contaminants exist in nearby proximity, due to the fuel terminals, but not onsite.
- What is the level of remediation for the site? It is heading towards domestic remediation. There is still some debate around whether or not the concrete piers will remain in place.

### 3.3. Community feedback

Mr McBain asked how the background level for asbestos monitoring is determined. Does this come from previous air monitoring studies? Will it be the same baseline used for the long-term air monitoring sub-committee? Ms Miles is not aware of any other comparable monitoring and advised that the <0.01 fibres/mL level was determined by the Local Recovery Committee. SafeWork’s health monitoring guide for asbestos refers to background levels in the air and references the ‘5,500 fibres inhaled every day by the average person’. Mr Porigneaux confirmed that the long-term monitoring plan will include information about how the background level is determined.

Ms Kilby asked what measures are in place to prevent similar incidents in the future. There is another building being used for storage in Wickham that will also contain asbestos, for example. Can this facility be checked? Do they have sprinklers? Is there a risk of fuel on the concrete from the vehicles stored inside? Mr Clarke asked Mr Kilby to provide the details offline. FRNSW and NSW Police have completed a debrief on the Wickham Wool Store fire incident. The Local Recovery Committee will also be completing an After-Action Review which will consider prevention measures for future incidents.

Mr Banyard asked about the status of the remaining Wool Store building that did not catch fire. Mr Clarke advised the remaining roof has been cleaned from asbestos fragments. Fencing remains in place along Annie Street. The structural integrity of the building is satisfactory. The grass verge has been replaced on the eastern end of Annie street. Mr Porigneaux believes the building is vacant.

Mr Banyard asked if asbestos monitors can be added to the existing LHAQMN. Ms Miles advised the existing network does not have this capacity and the asbestos monitors will event based, not continuous.

---

*The Chair concluded the discussion and thanked all attendees. The NCCCE members were invited to stay for the second part of the meeting relating to quarterly matters and business arising. Mr Wall, Dr Dalton, Mr Porigneaux, Mr McBain, Mr McCauley, Ms Kilby and Ms Busted left the meeting.*

---

## 4. Previous Minutes and Outstanding Actions – quarterly meeting

### 4.1. Review previous minutes

The minutes from the previous quarterly meeting on 21 February 2022 were adopted without changes.

### 4.2. Outstanding actions

No.	Outstanding action	Status	Lead
2.2.5	Meeting No. 61, Action 4: EPA to work with HCCDC on any options for a site visit	Ongoing – it was agreed that this should be revisited	Mike Bardsley Anthony Van Der Horst David Gathercole

## 5. EPA update

### 5.1. Regulatory Operations Metropolitan North

Ms Miles gave the following operational updates:

- Following the EPA Hunter River Pollutant Project, Bartter Enterprises has taken intermediary action to reduce nitrogen, ammonia and TSS in effluent. The changes to their licence are available on the public register. The EPA is meeting with Bartter every fortnight for progress updates. The EPA also engaged with Hunter Water who have agreed to revisit their business case based on the scope of the work involved and budget available.

- Mr Banyard asked whether rumours about the Baiada plant at Beresfield closing are true, and if so, what plans are in place to avoid leaving a mess behind. Ms Miles was unable to confirm but is aware of the risk. If they do leave the site, they will still be contactable after they have left.
- Cargills have received no odour complaints since February this year. They have prepared their odour modelling and are now waiting on the report. This will come to the EPA and likely go on their licence to be monitored on an ongoing basis.

## 6. Industry Update

### 6.1. Orica

Mr Robinson shared the following updates:

- The prill tower scrubber project is still on schedule for completion in September 2023.
- The tertiary abatement technology project is also on schedule. All three plants are due for completion in September, October and December.

### 6.2. Australian Rail Track Corporation (ARTC)

Nil.

### 6.3. Port Waratah Coal Services (PWCS)

Ms Larnach shared the following updates:

- PWCS sustainability report 2021 has recently been published [online](#).
- A new release Storylines website is also available [online](#).
- PWCS has new operating reporting conditions that are live on the public register.

## 7. Network Update

### 7.1. Information sharing and feedback from broader networks

The community representatives raised the following:

- Mr Crick invited any interested community members to apply for the Hunter Environmental Institute committee.

## 8. Air Quality Monitoring Network

### 8.1. Summer 2021/2022 Newsletter

Dr White presented the summer 2021/2022 seasonal newsletter, including the following key points:

- Air quality in Newcastle region was generally good in summer 2021/2022.
- Levels of all pollutants were under national standards.
- There were 28 days over the PM10 daily benchmark. Regional maximum daily PM10 levels on these days ranged from 50.6 to 95.9  $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ .
- There were no days over the benchmark at Beresfield, Carrington, Newcastle and Wallsend.
- At Mayfield, PM10 was over the daily benchmark on 27 January.

Mr Crick asked where the Mayfield monitor was and asked if the exceedance related to the fire at a garbage disposal site. Dr White confirmed the location on top of the hill and that the exceedance was for PM10 not PM2.5. This was likely due to lawn mowing or similar, that created dust.

Mr Banyard commented that the monitors are performing remarkably well.

Mr Banyard asked if Stockton is still the only monitor recording ammonia and if there has been any more consideration of adding an extra metre on the Mayfield monitor to capture Koppers emissions. Ms Larnach reminded Mr Banyard that this issue has been discussed previously and it was agreed that no extra metre would be added as it relates to event based monitoring.

Dr White briefly presented the previous four-year review to the committee. A draft for the upcoming four-year review will be presented at the next meeting and the committee will be invited to provide feedback.

Feedback will not hinder the timeline for completion. Ms Larnach asked if all licensees will be invited to contribute to the review and provided with information. Dr White agreed. There were no further questions.

Action Item No	Action	Person Responsible
2	Feedback to be sought on the four-year review from all licensees	Stephen White

## 9. General Business

### 9.1. Other

Nil.

### 9.2. Evaluation

Ms Bradley provided a copy of a short evaluation survey, inviting meeting attendees to provide feedback on the format and effectiveness of the meeting.

### 9.3. Next Meeting Date

The next meeting date was confirmed as Monday 15 August 2021 at 5.30pm. It will be the last meeting of the current NCCCE term. Members will be notified if any additional meetings are scheduled.

The Chair closed the meeting at 8.10pm.

## Tab 1:

### Questions provided by Mr Banyard on behalf of the local community – updated 7 April 2022:

Qu 1. Following a request from members at a community meeting Rick Banyard as an NCCCE Community Representative requested John Tate, as Chair, to call a meeting of the EPA's NCCCE to be briefed in order to help inform the community. That meeting nominated the need for a follow up The notes in this font style were added during the week beginning the 4th April 2022 using responses from community members. It should be noted that this does not include any information from the confidential April Leaflet distributed by Gina.

Answer:

2. The community is very upset with the EPA as the feeling is that little is being done. What has been done to date and what is the ongoing plan? The community is not happy with the clean-up and is very stressed

3. It seems the complaints line was a problem. Is this correct? How were after hours calls handled?

*The EPA complaints line would seem to have been not fit for purpose. The low number of registrations must be of concern. Only about 400 registrations out of about 15,000 potential impacts.*

*The registrations to the EPA do not seem to have been translated into a viable and transparent action plan.*

4. There is a lack of knowledge about how to contact the EPA and or register their impact. What steps were taken to distribute contact information?

*The Community still seems not confident to contact the EPA.*

5. Islington Park was surrounded with marker tape on Wednesday afternoon but there were no signs to indicate what the tape was for. (on Thursday morning there were some signs that said "Danger Park Close" however there is no indication why. (large numbers particularly bike riders ignored the warning and the tapes were cut as it the tape was the finishing line for the Tour De France.)

Who erected the tape? What was the purpose of the tape?

Did the EPA recommend the tape?

When will the area be deemed safe and the tape removed?

Who is responsible for compliance?

*This issue has been very poorly handled and the questions are still largely unanswered.*

*Even this week the community is concerned by the resumption of mowing with rotary mowers cutting the grass very short.*

6. The closure of the Park does not seem to be supported by any actions related to adjoining roadways, public land and private property.

Are areas outside the Park and other designated areas totally safe?

*This question is unanswered*

7. It would seem that the extent of the impacted area is largely unknown. It was reported that the Mater Hospital was filthy, that Station St Waratah and Georgetown, Tighes Hill TAFE Campus and Islington School were impacted.

What role did the EPA play in closing some areas?

What methods of clean up did the EPA recommend?

How were contaminated areas determined?

How were non contaminated areas determined?

Is it correct that many hosed areas were washed into watercourses?

*This question is unanswered*



8. A map of the impacted area is urgently needed.

Has a map of impacted areas been developed?

Does the map identify by grade of contamination?

*There is no map publicly available.*

9. There was no SMS emergency danger messaging of the community. (the Council have done flood alerts)

Why did the EPA not distribute danger messaging?

How did the EPA distribute information to the community and the media?

*This question is unanswered*

10. Is it the responsibility of the EPA to inform insurance companies, planning authorities, Council and other bodies that the lands under the plume and associated areas are contaminated or potentially contaminated with asbestos and possibly other chemicals?

*This question is unanswered*

11. The community has been advised that the clean-up of environmentally harmful substances e.g. asbestos could take 12 months or more. Does the EPA have a 12-month timeline of actions?

12. Vehicles and people movements are spreading the fallen material.

Are vehicles and people movement considered to be a risk?

*Some work has been done to clean street surfaces and reduce wheel tracking.*

*Maps showing the cleaned roads were published*

13. The rain is, in the short term, reducing the impact and masking the potential.

What will be the risk as the material dries out and what actions should the community take to mitigate the risk?

*The rain has assisted in reducing the hazard is some respect however drains and watercourses have been impacted*

14. What is impact on waterways as this material is washed into drains and creeks?

*This question is unanswered*

15. What is the impact of the roof top material that drains into rainwater tanks?

*This question is unanswered*

16. Who does the EPA consider is responsible to clean up the asbestos and other fire related substances from roofs, gutters, trees and other above ground surfaces?

*This question has resulted in vague statements and actions. There is need for a clear explanation.*

17. Does the EPA consider motor vehicles to be part of the contaminated property. Will the EPA be organizing and paying for the professional decontamination?

*This question is unanswered*

18. Has the origin of the building roofing been identified as the origin of the material can impact on the potential harm.

*This question is unanswered*

19. Is it correct that the analysis of a fallen sample has identified at least three type of asbestos? (Chrystile Asbestos (white asbestos), Amosite Asbestos (brown asbestos), Crocidolite Asbestos (“this is the most toxic, dangerous, and outright lethal form of the material out there”)?

What variants as the EPA samples identified?

What does the EPA consider the risk to the community is? (both short and long term)

*The answer to this question is minimal*

*Where is the public register of samples taken and results?*

*What is the risk to the community and how can it be mitigated?*

20. Has the EPA identified other substances that have been released into the atmosphere, soil, water or wasted as a result of the fire or the clean up?

*This question is unanswered*

21. How will the demolition material be handled and disposed of in order to meet EPA standards?

*This question is unanswered, but work is advanced.*

*Is the fire rubble considered to be contaminated?*

*Will there be a report?*

*Why is the truck wash just running down the gutter in the Avenue?*

22. There is an urgent need for quality environmental information to be dispersed in the community. How can this be done?

*This question is unanswered*

23. The incident should be treated as if a 'Asbestos Bomb' has gone off showering the surrounding streets and homes in contamination.

Does the EPA accept this concept?

*This question is unanswered*

24. Literally every exterior surface over an area as large as 20 to 30 square kilometres is contaminated asbestos debris. Roads, footpaths, the nature strip, cars, lawns and residents' homes and backyards.

Does the EPA agree with this assessment?

Is the primary product super Six made by James Hardie? If not, what is it?

Have the two destroyed wool stores been reroofed since being erected in the early 1940's? Is when and what with?

*This question is unanswered*

25. Does the EPA have Single easy to access source of information and advice?

Is it updated in real time?

*This question is unanswered*

*It is noted that the EPA and NCC has published material and posted on their websites in an uncoordinated manner.*

26. The safe removal of the asbestos is a time sensitive matter otherwise the long-term health risks could be exacerbated.

What does EPA recommend as a safe timeframe?

*This question is unanswered*

27. Direct communication with affected residents to get them updated with the decontamination process and schedule is essential.

How can this be achieved?

*This question is unanswered*

28. The major concern is the microparticles that cannot be picked up and when they become airborne once the weather dries. The issue is that specialised HEPA vacs cannot be used while the ground is wet.

How can microparticles be addressed?

*This question is unanswered*

29. What are legal safe levels of Asbestos in residential environments?

*This question is unanswered*

30. How does the EPA recommend that lawns and parkland be made safe?

*This question is unanswered*

31. Who is legally and financially liable for the safe removal of the Asbestos, the rendering of the neighbour safe for current residents and the future? (As well any potential ill health both physical and mental to residents and their children in the years to come).

*This very important question is unanswered*

32. How will the EPA mitigate the possibility of property devaluation due the incident and result contamination and sigma? Will the EPA issue certificates of cleanliness?

*This question is unanswered*

33. What measures will the EPA take to ensure the remaining Wool store buildings (and other similar Hunter Valley properties will not put the community at risk during fires, floods and other natural disasters?

*This question is unanswered*

34. It is common for the residents to have vegetable gardens, water tanks and fruit trees etc. Are these safe for consumption by humans and pets?

*This question is unanswered*

35. What role does the EPA have in ensuring that residents (and businesses) can return into their environmentally safe properties?

*This question is unanswered however most have returned. The question is still valid.*

36. Will the EPA sponsor a public briefing within the next 14 days?

*This question was unanswered however the Police hosted a meeting that was of some help.*

## Tab 1:

### Additional questions provided by Mr Banyard on behalf of the local community:

As a complement to the previous 35 questions previously tabled the following questions are tabled for response

1. There is a urgent need for a publicly accessible map showing:
  - i. The perimeter of the area considered to be contaminate (Red Zone)
  - ii. The inner border of the area considered not to be contaminated (green Zone)
  - iii. The mid zone. (orange zone.)
  - iv. Fully Cleaned and permanently rectified (blue zone)Can this map be made available and updated as required?
2. There are considerable issues with those doing the clean-up work.
  - Who engages the asbestos workers?
  - Who asses their work standards?
  - Who signs off on their work?
  - Is there warranty on their work?
  - Who issues the certificate of clearance?
  - Who authorises payment?
3. The issue of the mowing of Islington Park is a real concern. The signage states that "Islington Park has been cleaned and given clearance to reopen to the community" as determined by an Independent Licenced Asbestos Assessor. Why then was the mowing being done with a large motorized rotary mower operated by a person dressed in a safety suit etc whilst the public walked by?
4. Filters were used to trap asbestos from entering drains etc. Who's responsible to ensure that these filters have been removed and disposed of in an authorized manner? Who should collect the ones still laying around in streets?
5. The Islington Public School was impacted by fallout and very thoroughly cleaned prior handing back to the education authorities. The school was subsequently re cleaned and the site extensively excavated etc. Why is the standard of remediation works for the school to a much higher standard than other properties and public areas?