



Minutes

Meeting:	Newcastle Community Consultative Committee on the Environment (out of session)	Date:	Thursday 7 April 2022
Location:	EPA office, 117 Bull Street, Newcastle West	Time:	5.30pm – 7.30pm
Last Meeting:	Monday 7 March 2022	Next Meeting:	Monday 16 May 2021
Present:	John Tate – Chairperson Rick Banyard – Community representative Keith Craig – Community representative Christopher Tola – Community representative Glenn Cook – Industry delegate Leah Cook – Industry representative Paul McBain – observer Gina Bradley – EPA Jacinta Hanemann – EPA John Formosa – Public Works Advisory (PWA) Philippe Porigneaux – NSW Health Craig Dalton – NSW Health Paul McMurray – City of Newcastle David Clarke – City of Newcastle Karyn Davidson – SafeWork NSW Jason Wall – SafeWork NSW Thomas Hudson – Regional NSW		
Apologies:	Trudie Larnach – Industry representative Nathan Robinson – Industry representative Steven Crick – Environmental representative Terry McCauley – observer Lyn Kilby – observer		

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 and declaration of interests

The Chair welcomed the committee and noted the apologies.

1.3. Housekeeping and introduction

Ms Bradley outlined procedures for participating in the meeting online. Mr Banyard requested that the meeting be recorded and made available to members present and apologies. The request was denied, but the meeting minutes will be made available on the website once endorsed by the committee.

The Chair outlined the purpose of the meeting and role of the group. It was also noted that there might not be immediate answers to all questions asked, however a written response would be supplied, and a follow up meeting could help address these.

2. Previous Minutes and Outstanding Actions

2.1. Adoption of minutes from previous out of session meeting

The minutes of the previous out of session meeting were not accepted as an accurate reflection of the meeting by Mr Banyard. The adoption of these minutes will be carried over to the next meeting.

2.2. Outstanding actions from previous out of session meeting

There were no outstanding action items raised by other members.

Mr Banyard subsequently advised that due to a major audio problem, he was unable to communicate his wish that his prepared and previously lodged 35 question community response documents be tabled for a further response.

3. Wool Store Fire, Annie St, Wickham

3.1. Agency update

The following update was shared on behalf of the relevant NSW Government agencies:

EPA

- A brief overview of the incident was provided, with an update that the multi-agency response to the fire has now transitioned to a Local Recovery Committee. The Local Recovery Committee is chaired by City of Newcastle, with representation from the EPA, Public Works Advisory, NSW Health and SafeWork NSW. Each of the agencies have role in the recovery effort.
- The EPA is responsible for the management of information, triaging of community reports of ACD and the timely communication of information to the local community.
- The polluter is responsible for cleaning up following a pollution incident. Investigations into the responsible party and cause of the fire are ongoing.
- The framework for the clean-up has been documented in an Emergency Asbestos Management Plan, which has been signed off the by the Recovery Committee.
- The committee was thanked for all their feedback provided to date. Since the last meeting, there have been lots of updates to keep the community informed. This includes another community meeting, two drop-in sessions (total 50 attendees), two letterbox drops (2000+ households), two bulk mailouts (350 email addresses), plus regular updates to our website and social media. It was recognised that there is an ongoing need to provide accessible information.
- A draft community update was circulated to the meeting attendees in advance of the meeting. One of the objectives of the meeting is to receive feedback on how to best to communicate the information in the update before it is distributed to the broader community.

City of Newcastle

- City of Newcastle's role includes supporting the agency process, providing a central information point on the website, responsibility for clean-up of public domain and public services.
- Public domain clean-up is largely complete. A licenced asbestos assessor contractor has issued clearance certificates for all of these areas. Roslyn Street and Milford Avenue are the only remaining streets to be cleaned. There is a good process in place to address any reports of asbestos being found post clean up.
- Green bin collection was suspended due to concerns of potential contamination from green waste. Licenced asbestos assessors were deployed to safely empty green bins. This is now largely complete, aside from those on the streets closest to the fire.
- Mowing at Islington Park and Waratah park was also suspended. Safe protocols were in place to test mowing. Air monitoring results and samples taken have come back all clear, so mowing will

resume over the next week. Community sport will also resume. City of Newcastle will also ensure other community services and activities can resume safely.

- It was acknowledged that further asbestos may be found. There is a protocol in place for unexpected finds in public areas to address this.

PWA

- PWA is responsible for managing and defining the scope of works for the clean-up of asbestos impacted areas. Their role includes engage the contractors and overseeing the completion of the clean-up works.
- There have been 180 private properties cleaned, in addition to 120 apartment units. PWA anticipate the remaining clean up works to be complete within the next four weeks.
- The process for assessment includes separating areas and sending a batch of properties to the contractor who works with the licensed asbestos assessor. The licensed asbestos assessor contacts the batched properties to arrange a clean-up. The licensed asbestos assessor then assesses individual items to clean, and the contractor will arrange a time to complete the clean-up. The property owner will then endorse each item that has been cleaned, and the Licensed Asbestos Assessor will issue a clearance certificate. This is a well-established process and has been used for other sites including during the bushfire recovery.
- Air monitoring is taking place both on site whilst undertaking cleaning and also at other locations in the impacted area. All results have been below background levels. An audit checklist and soil sampling is undertaken to ensure contractors are working correctly.

NSW Health

- NSW Health has been providing support to the incident management team and the Local Recovery Committee. They have been providing public health information, attending community information sessions, and assisting with the communication with the broader community.
- We are exposed to asbestos fibres every day; there are asbestos fibres at background levels in our community.
- When asbestos is heated during a fire it can travel over long distances and break down into smaller material.
- The advice to the community has been to avoid disturbing asbestos. The rain has helped prevent fibres from becoming airborne.

SafeWork

- SafeWork is the work health and safety regulator for NSW. SafeWork's role in the incident recovery involves providing advice on the safe management and removal of asbestos and contributing to the development of the Emergency Asbestos Management Plan.
- Inspectors have been on site ensuring that workers are appropriately trained, using appropriate PPE and complying with appropriate SafeWork procedures are being undertaken.
- SafeWork developed a protocol for unexpected finds that is detailed in the draft community update. This is to assist residents in safely managing the removal of asbestos, in the circumstance where a licensed asbestos professional has not been engaged.
- A series of videos have also been provided as a link in the draft community update on how to identify and safely manage asbestos.

3.2. Structured discussion

The following questions were asked with responses provided by relevant representatives from the Local Recovery Committee:

Why were green bin collections suspended but red and yellow bin collections were not?

- There were concerns that potentially contaminated green waste was being emptied into green bins. A third of green bins tested showed the presence of asbestos. Testing was not undertaken of red bins. However, protocols are in place for red bins if asbestos is identified at any stage during waste collection.

Why was green bin collection suspended from other streets outside of the core impact area?

- An entire collection area was suspended, that included the area impacted due to the fire. The entire collection area was slightly broader than the fire impacted zone. It was acknowledged that this caused inconvenience for those in the broader area. Regular service has now resumed.
- Mr Banyard pointed out that the entire area was not suspended and that streets declared clean had still suffered suspensions. Mr Clarke explained that wheel tracking by garbage trucks was an issue. Mr Banyard asked why this did not apply to all garbage trucks. Mr Banyard also asked if the bin sample test results were available.

Why was full PPE worn by Council staff when carrying out rotary mowing at Islington Park, when the signage states that the park has been cleaned and given clearance to reopen? This was alarming for community to see. Why was the area was not cordoned off? People were using the shared pathway only metres away.

- There was a protocol in place. Mr Clarke agreed to take this question on notice.

What is the position on cleaning at heights?

- The contractors are using mobile scaffold with a base height of 3m. This means contractors can reach above 3m as far as they can and in some cases use pool extensions that have been fitted on to the HEPA vacuums. However, they are not able to climb on roofs due to safety concerns.

Who is going to clean the roofs?

- On properties closer to the fire source mobile cranes were used to enable contractors to clean the roofs. This is because large fragments are largely found closer to the fire source. Large fragments are more likely to stay on roofs. On properties further from the fire source, smaller fragments are found. Smaller fragments are more likely to be washed into gutters. The gutters are being cleaned. If any large fragments are found on roofs further from the fire source it will be recorded on the visual clearance certificate.

How will roofs and gutters be cleaned on two-storey properties? Has there been a count of two-storey buildings?

- There are restrictions within the scope of works relating to inaccessible areas. Fragments that are inaccessible and undisturbed do not present a health risk to residents.
- What about tradesman that come to the property to do work either now or in the future and there have been fragments left on the roof, who is going to clean these fragments? There is one known property where tradesman have advised they will not complete work until the owner gets a clearance certificate. Mr Banyard pointed out that the fire caused the problem to the total property from fence to fence and the total property should be cleaned including the roof and land. If it is not 100% cleaned how can a certificate of clearance be issued?
- A response was not provided to this question.

How are the HEPA vacuums tested and serviced? It was noted that domestic type vacuums have been observed in use.

Asbestos vacuums are H Class and are required to be DOP (Dispersed Oil Particulate) tested every 12 months by an independent testing facility. This ensures the vacuum maintains its minimum efficiency requirements, that prevent asbestos fibres being expelled into the atmosphere during operation. SafeWork audits include visual inspections of vacuum cleaners' condition and sighting of current DOP certificates. How will the health impacts change when we start to experience dry or windy weather?

- All the existing data has indicated that asbestos fibres are below background levels. There will be a future air quality monitoring plan.
- Hazmat carry out the individual air monitoring. The membrane filter method is used to monitor asbestos. They identify the concentration in the air by counting the number of fibres.

Do the existing Newcastle air quality monitoring stations monitor for asbestos?

- No, they do not monitor for asbestos, their purpose is to monitor for PM10 and PM2.5.

The Local Recovery Committee then asked for general feedback on the best way to communicate information with the broader community and any gaps in the draft community update. The following is a summary of the feedback provided:

Communication channels

Newcastle Voice

- Newcastle Voice has thousands of subscribers and could be a good communication tool.
- City of Newcastle confirmed that they have primarily used their website for communications and have also distributed information in hard copy via letterbox drops. Newcastle Voice will be considered for future communications.

Distributed Message Service (DMS)

- DMS signage can be helpful and has been used in the area previously to communicate other messages. It would be good if this can be utilised.

Community drop ins

- These have been effective for enabling direct conversations with representatives from key agencies. It is proposed that this communication channel will be used again, possibly including one next Wednesday at the Goodlife Church.

Mailouts

- There is a gap in communication with landlords and strata managers. The focus has been with the person residing in the property. This creates issues where a tenant is signing off on the scope of works without the property owner/manager being involved.
- Mailouts have been sent to the list of everyone who has registered or contact the EPA about the incident. It does not include emails to landlords.
- Council could generate contact details from their list of ratepayers.

Radio

- This should be continued as a communication channel.
- The EPA confirmed there has been lots of radio coverage and it was recognised that is an effective way to target those in the community who do not have access to digital media.

NCCCE

- Mr Banyard pointed out that to refuse the request to record the meeting was a lost golden opportunity. It was requested that the meeting should be recorded so that it could be made available to the community to assist with communications.
- It was also suggested that there was a missed opportunity to engage the NCCCE members earlier and that they could be upskilled to work with the incident management team.
- It would be good to involve more members of the community in future NCCCE meetings where appropriate.
- Mr Banyard advised that a separate community group has been suggested by the broader community and a Facebook page site had been established to help with communications. The community is interested in being involved.

Letterbox drops

- Lots of residents have not received any information in their letterbox.
- The EPA confirmed that letterbox drops were delivered to over 2000 properties in proximity to the fire site. A broader range will be considered for future letterbox drops.

Social media

- Social media is effective.

Gaps in communication

Communication with local industry

- Businesses including ARTC had not been given any formal notice about the recovery process. It would be good to communicate with other businesses that presumably also did not receive any direct information. It is important that those workers receive the same level of protection.
- The EPA could utilise their database to obtain contact details for licenced premises in the Newcastle Local Government Area. Industry forums could also be utilised to support messaging, for example the Hunter Business Chamber.

Responsibility for clean-up of the area adjacent to the rail corridor and other privately owned industrial land

- The scope of works is restricted to public domain and private residences, it does not extend to the rail corridor or local industry. ARTC have communicated with their workforce and are continually operating under unexpected finds protocol but have not done proactive screening for asbestos. The Chair acknowledged that there will likely be fallout in the industrial area. If industry is responsible for this it needs to be clearly communicated with them.
- If ARTC is a state-owned corporation and therefore on publicly owned land, it would be good to address this in communications. Ms Cook subsequently confirmed that ARTC is not a state-owned corporation and does not take responsibility for the clean-up. The polluter is ultimately responsible for the clean-up.

Communication with unregistered properties

- If only 400 properties have registered, it is possible that many more have not registered because they are not aware that they are entitled to. This could be improved with more information to the border community.
- Concerns were also raised regarding the risk to community if residents have asbestos on their property but decide not to engage a licensed asbestos assessor. This could be resolved if clean-up is made mandatory in a clearly defined impact area.
- PWA engaged consultants to map the density of asbestos. They identified areas that ranged from numerous large size fragments to less than 1 piece (less than a 5-cent coin) per 100m². People who are not impacted should not be delaying the process for those who are impacted. If you cannot see asbestos on your property, the licenced asbestos assessors are less likely to find asbestos on the property.
- It was clarified that there are not 15,000 impacted properties. The Local Recovery Committee are triaging the reports that have been made by community. Whilst it is important to be proactive, the community should not be unnecessarily alarmed where they are at low risk.

Absence of a map

- The community have indicated a need for a map identifying four zones as per question 1 in **Tab 2**:
 - The perimeter of the area considered to be contaminated (red zone)
 - The inner border of the area considered not to be contaminated (green zone)
 - The mid zone (orange zone.)
 - Fully cleaned and permanently rectified (blue zone)
- Mr Banyard pointed out that the map was essential for the following reasons:
 - Council is already implementing its own version of zones e.g., green bin non collection
 - There is a requirement by law to specify contaminated lands
 - Property owners have a disclosure requirement to insurance companies
 - Insurance companies are likely to set premiums based on risk zones
 - For conveyancing and rental purposes landlords, agents, property managers need to have a reliable source of information for disclosures etc.

- The map was a very simple and effective tool to distribute information.
- There has been lots of debate by the Local Recovery Committee on this issue. A decision has been made not to provide map, as affected batched properties are being directly engaged for the clean-up works, properties that are not affected should not frustrate the delivery of resources to the batched properties
- The draft community update will be released to the community through a variety of communication channels early next week. It is anticipated that the community update will encourage other properties to register.
- It was acknowledged that there may be ongoing unexpected finds. There are processes in place to manage this.

Timeframe for clean up

- Follow up phone calls have been made to those who have registered and not yet received a clean. However, it would be good to have more clarity on timeframes, particularly in the lead up to holidays when many residents will be away.

Long term monitoring

- There is residual concern around health risks if smaller fragments become airborne when weather conditions change.
- The Local Recovery Committee is considering a plan for long term air quality monitoring. It is likely that this will not see a lot of fibres in the long term. The fire is likely to have destroyed asbestos fibres in the air during the incident. Nonetheless, a long-term plan is being considered to address the community concern.

Clean up of Islington Public School

- It is not clear why the initial clean-up of Islington Public School was not adequate. It is also not clear why the standard of clean-up for the school was not adopted in other public spaces.
- City of Newcastle confirmed that there have been circumstances where material has been removed from community gardens and playgrounds. A similar process has been adopted in other public spaces. The objective has remained the same. but the treatment and circumstances may have been different. Air quality monitoring, soil sampling and machinery sampling at Islington Park found asbestos to be below background levels, so there was no need to remove the turf.
- PWA confirmed that Islington Public School had a large Industrial HEPA vacuum to clean up the site. This is the same equipment used to clean up other properties. The turf was removed because the clean-up would otherwise have required two additional large Industrial HEPA vacuums.
- It was suggested that this story should be communicated to the broader community to explain this logic.

4. General Business

4.1. Other

Mr Banyard asked for the two documents submitted before the meeting to be documented with the meeting minutes. They are attached at **Tab 1** and **Tab 2**. Mr Banyard also requested that in light of the Chairs ruling at the commencement of the meeting relating to the answering of questions that all the questions in the two documents be answered in writing for the community to consider.

Mr Tola has experience engaging with a broad range of stakeholders and recognised the efforts made by the Local Recovery Committee to communicate with the community. His local community are a diverse audience and appear to be well informed and know where to find updated information. Mr McBain agreed that it has been a challenging time with the floods happening simultaneously.

There is an intention to do an After-Action Review to document the learnings from the incident response and recovery.

4.2. Evaluation

Ms Bradley provided a link to a short evaluation survey, inviting meeting attendees to provide feedback on the format and effectiveness of the meeting. Mr McBain asked if details of future meetings could be communicated in a more timely and appropriate manner.

Action Item No	Action	Person Responsible
1	Follow up the question regarding PPE being worn when carrying out rotary mowing at Islington Park, when signage stated that the park has been cleaned and given clearance to reopen	David Clarke
2	That a response to all questions in the minutes not fully answered be prepared and distributed	Gina Bradley
3	That written answers be prepared to all the questions tabled in Tab 1 and Tab 2 and distributed in a timely manner before the next meeting.	Gina Bradley

Tab 1:

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

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.

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?