



Housing Agency of Jamaica Limited

Public Presentation

**Part of Mona, Papine Estates and Goldsmith
Villa, St. Andrew (called Mona Estate, Section 1)**

Wednesday, April 25, 2012

Knutsford Court Hotel
Ruthven Road
Kingston 10
Jamaica, W.I.

Meeting commenced at 5:40 p.m.

CHAIRMAN: Ladies and gentlemen, good evening. Welcome to the Environmental Impact Assessment for the Mona Land Subdivision, Part of Mona and Papine Estates and Goldsmith Villa in St. Andrew.

I am Howard Mitchell. I am your Chairman for this event. I am an attorney at law by profession, retired, and the immediate past chairman of the National Housing Trust.

My only function here this evening is to attempt to conduct these proceedings with order, civility and with impartiality.

To that end, I am proposing that first of all, we operate under what is known as Robert's Rules of Order; the main principles of which are that we conduct ourselves with decency and courtesy to each other.

We have a microphone in the centre of the room. We will entertain one question at a time. We are proposing a limit of three minutes per question. The questions might be segmented, serialized, phased, but they must be asked within the three minute time frame.

There is a court reporter present so I am asking that you speak slowly and clearly so that the proceedings can properly be recorded.

Questions must be relevant, unfortunately in my opinion, to the proceedings and to the issues raised by the presentation and must not be editorial or policy statements.

One follow up clarificatory question will be allowed after each response is given. No repeat questioning by any one person will be allowed until all others have been satisfied. Questions will go by rote.

There must be one meeting. I cannot entertain side meetings; side discussions in the room. If you are going to have them, I have no difficulty if you step outside.

Questioners must state their names and their connection to the issue, prior to putting their question. Any issue surrounding that?

Yes, ma'am.

MS. McCAULAY: My name is Diana McCaulay, I am from the Jamaica Environment Trust. I hear you are...

CHAIRMAN: Sorry, I'm also hard of hearing, sorry.

MS. McCAULAY: Sorry, I've lost my voice. Everybody will be glad to hear.

I just have a question about the actual presentation and the rules governing that. In the past we, not particularly related to this issue, but I am a veteran of such meetings and we have had presentations going on for a very long time. We are leaving a very short time for the public part. So I would like to hear what kind of...

CHAIRMAN: I am told that the presentation will take thirty to forty minutes. I would like to propose that we allow an hour for questioning and discussion. Is that agreeable?

MS. McCAULAY: Yes. Well, to me.

CHAIRMAN: Well, that is a good start.

There is an agenda.

MS. McCAULAY: Is there?

CHAIRMAN: I have one, sorry. If you haven't received one I can read it out for you. The agenda says: welcome and introduction, it also says Chairman's message. I have none. There is a presentation by EPN Consultancy, which we referred earlier, which is estimated, as I said, to take thirty to forty minutes.

I will not entertain questions during the presentation. I would ask that you hold your questions until the presentation is complete. And then there is a question and answer period which we are

proposing for an hour, if there are that many questions, and then hopefully any other business and adjournment.

By nature I seek to be very pleasant by upbringing and very civil. However, I will have no hesitation in suspending or terminating the meeting if any of these rules, including normal rules of courtesy, are breached.

Yes, ma'am.

MS. BEDASSE: Hello, good evening, my name is Aisha Bedasse from NEPA. There is a statement from NEPA that usually precedes the presentation so it should have been included in the agenda.

CHAIRMAN: And that statement will be made in the presentation?

MS. BEDASSE: That statement will be made by myself.

CHAIRMAN: I am finished. If there are any other questions?

MR. E. DAWKINS: Who will the question be directed to, just EPN?

CHAIRMAN: All questions must be directed to the Chairman.

MR. E. DAWKINS: No, but who will be there to answer me?

CHAIRMAN: There are supposed to be consultants here and members of NEPA, members of the Housing Agency of Jamaica. I hope they are aware that the meeting has started. I told them that it had. I know

there are some folks outside. Is there anybody that can call them in for me please?

The requirement that names be stated before the questions are asked is also applicable to those who are answering the questions; names and connection, so that I would ask that members of EPN Consultancy, NEPA, whoever is responding, states their name, their position and their connection.

I am not aware if there is anybody else sitting at the Head Table with me. I don't know if there is anybody from HAJ, but I'm quite happy to be up there by myself.

MS. BEDASSE: Hello, good evening, everyone. As I said before, my name is Aisha Bedasse and I am from the Applications Management Division of the National Environment & Planning Agency. I'm here today to deliver the statement from the agency.

Before I begin, I would like to tender apologies on behalf of Mr. Peter Knight. He is the Chief Executive Officer of the National Environment and Planning Agency and he has been unavoidably detained.

“On 21 July 2009, the site selected for the proposed development was declared under the Housing Act, 1955 by the Honourable Minister of Water and Housing. On 13 October 2009 the National Environment and Planning Agency received an application from the Housing Agency of Jamaica (HAJ) for an Environmental Permit in

the subdivision of 8.4505 hectares into 60 lots comprising of (54 service lots and 6 lots for associated amenities).

An Environmental Statement was submitted in support of the application by the HAJ. The document was reviewed and a decision arrived at that additional information was required. As a consequence NEPA mandated that an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) be conducted for the project. The Terms of Reference (TORs) for the EIA were submitted and reviewed internally and by external stakeholders. The ToRs were approved in letter dated 03 June 2011 and the HAJ was advised to proceed with the preparation of the EIA.

The EIA was submitted to the NEPA on 13 June 2011 and circulated for comments. A public presentation was held on 21 July 2011 at the Courtleigh Hotel at which the proposal was presented to the public, in accordance with the “Guidelines for Conducting Public Presentations” dated 2007-10-25. The comments were received from the general public and these along with those received from external agencies were collated and returned to the HAJL in letter dated 11 October 2011. The HAJL subsequently submitted responses to the comments with cover letter dated 24 November 2011. This document was reviewed and it was noted that a change had been made to the original proposal in that the open space slated for the area known as Mona Section 2 had been relocated to lots 53, 54 and 55.

Subsequent to these changes and the submission of a revised EIA document on 28 March 2012, the HAJL was mandated to convene another Public Meeting in accordance with “The Guidelines for Conducting Public Presentations”.

The revised EIA Report was circulated for comments and is currently being reviewed by the Agency. To date, no additional comments have been received. The Agency is represented at this meeting, to hear your comments, to observe the proceedings in relation to the development and the

additional information provided in the revised EIA.

This public meeting is an integral part of the public consultation that the HAJL is required to conduct by the NEPA. Please bear in mind that no final decision has been made on the application.

We wish to remind you that the process with respect to the public presentation for EIAs is as follows:

- 1. A copy of the Verbatim Minutes of the Public Presentation is submitted to the Agency by the applicant within seven (7) days of the Public Presentation.*
- 2. The public is allowed up to thirty (30) days after the date of the Public Presentation to provide written comments on the proposed development to the Agency.*
- 3. Upon receipt of the comments, they are collated and sent to the applicant for responses to be provided.*
- 4. When the responses are received, a submission is prepared to facilitate the discussions within NEPA. After the internal discussions, the application will be presented with a recommendation to a Technical Review Committee, a sub-committee of the Authority and finally to the Authority. Please note carefully that the Authority takes the final decision.... Not NEPA.*

The revised EIA is available to the public and the document can be accessed at the following locations:

- *NEPA's Documentation Centre*
- *NEPA's website*

<http://www.nepa.gov.jm/eeias/StAndrew/MonaPapineEstate/monapapine.ppdf>

- *Kingston & St. Andrew Parish Library*
- *Kingston and St. Andrew Corporation (KSAC)*

- <http://www.hajl.gov.jm>

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: We can now begin the presentation, sir. Do you want the lights dimmed?

(Lights dimmed for presentation)

CHAIRMAN: Is everybody able to see?

PARTICIPANTS: Yes.

MR. BEAL: Good afternoon everybody. My name is Marlon Beal and I will be making this presentation on...

PARTICIPANT: You are blocking the screen.

(Presenter relocates)

MR. BEAL: As I was saying, I am here to make the presentation on the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) for the proposed subdivision of lands Part of Mona and Papine Estates and Goldsmith Villa, St. Andrew, called Mona Section I.

The Project proponent is as a part of a proposal of the Housing Agency of Jamaica Limited in fulfilling its mandate to be an effective, financially viable and environmentally responsible housing solution facilitator and provider by 2013.

As we can see, the location of the proposed development is highlighted in red and is flanked on the northeastern by Long Mountain Warika Hill,

which is approximately three miles east of Half Way Tree. It is also flanked on the north by Pines of Karachi; the Long Mountain Country Club to the south and upscale Beverly Hills which is located west of the location.

The proposed project - as was earlier indicated, the proposed development or land use is based on zoning requirements wherein which 8.4 hectares - approximately 21 hectares will be used for housing solutions and approximately 81 hectares will remain as conservation for public open space.

We see here that the residential lots occupy 51 service lots which range from 755 square metres to just over 1300 square metres in area. There are open spaces and a retention area which is reserved for eighty per cent (80%) of the site storm water runoff. There is also physical infrastructure based on sewage and drainage easements as well as existing proposed areas for potable water.

There will be on site roads, four of which are reserved and one which is a service lot, and there will also be use of the existing telecom facility.

As we can see, here is a basic layout of the site in which key areas to note are the retention/detention area, an open space, a reserved open space. These are the service lots identified here as well as the existing potable water storage sections.

The project infrastructure comprises: for roads, transportation and traffic, there will be use of the Long Mountain and Karachi Avenue as access points. For potable water there will be use of a sixty thousand (60,000) gallon tank from the National Water Commission; for waste disposal, sewage, there will be use of the National Water Commission central sewage system and for storm water drainage this will be directed to the Mountain View Gully.

As a part of the public participation consultation process there were several activities conducted. We had telephone calls, face-to-face interviews, done both in May of 2010 and March of 2012. There was also a review of the discussion in the public domain. As earlier indicated by Miss Bedasse there was a public presentation of the EIA and there were community surveys conducted.

As a part of the overall process, key definitions needed to be identified: one of which was that of receptor communities and as indicated in the study, the receptor community highlighted in the assessment was an area of 1.5 kilometre radius of the location where the proposed development was to occur.

We see here, basically, identification of the electoral district, the number of households and population based on the 2001 Census which was utilized as a guide throughout the process of doing the public surveys.

Also, as a part of the public consultation and participation, there were questionnaires or questions asked to households within the adjoining communities. And a key question that was asked was, “what would be the main concern in the event of further housing construction and development within the area?”

In 2010 when the survey was conducted, the major concern was that of traffic congestion at forty per cent (40%) and we also noted that thirty per cent (30%) of persons indicated that they had no concerns, where we had ten per cent (10%) indicating environmental pollution and a further ten per cent (10%) indicating overcrowding as a concern.

In 2012 when the survey was redone, utilising the same question it was noted that environmental pollution had a forty-two per cent (42%) response to the concern of further housing construction.

It is important to note for this environmental pollution concern that most residents or most persons who were interviewed, indicated that their concern was in relation to issues of construction such as dust and noise pollution that would occur within the construction phase of the development, but thereafter they expressed that there was no concern further to that.

Again we saw a change in terms of traffic congestion, reducing to six per cent (6%) and overcrowding at four per cent (4%).

PARTICIPANT: How many people were interviewed?

CHAIRMAN: No, no.

PARTICIPANT; Okay, sorry.

CHAIRMAN: For those who came in after the movie started questions will be entertained at the end of the presentation.

PARTICIPANT: Okay.

MR. BEAL: Another question that's a part of the survey was, "what would you as a person recommend for the proposed housing development site?" In 2010 fifty-eight per cent (58%) of the people interviewed indicated that they would agree that a housing solution or housing development could occur at the proposed area. Another thirty-three per cent (33%) indicated that they believed the area should remain as a green space and two per cent (2%) and another five per cent (5%) indicated shops or not sure of what should occur there.

In 2012 forty per cent (40%) of respondents indicated a housing solution was agreeable. A further thirty per cent (30%) indicated not being sure and twenty-one per cent (21%) indicated that the area should remain a green area.

As a part of the survey the baseline environment was surveyed. This included physical, biological - human and social, natural hazards and heritage.

With respect to the physical, we see here, this being the Mona Dam, this is in lighter green here, the proposed development Mona Section I. We see here also currently occurring in the Long Mountain solution as well as natural storm water drainage at the foot of the Long Mountain opposite the National Water Commission property.

In terms of the geologic formation, we see that the site is underlain by two formations of white limestone groupings, the first of which is dominant, being the Newport White Limestone which shows a variation formed from massive rocks to a more honeycomb type structure.

Continuing on the physical, it is noted that approximately eighty per cent (80%) of the land mass exists on slopes which dip towards the west. So, it is basically indicating that the slope is on this side, not towards the Mona Reservoir itself.

There is an average slope gradient of fourteen degrees or twenty-five per cent (25%) and the elevation of the site ranges from 200 to 260 metres above sea level.

With respect to soil, the site is also underlain by Bonnygate Stony Loam and this is deposited as surficial material atop the limestone bedrock.

The soil generally is between two point five four (2.54) to thirty point four eight (30.48) centimetres and has a high erosion capacity, but also experiences rapid internal drainage due to the porosity of the limestone.

With respect to hydrology the project site falls within the Hope River Watershed Management Unit and for surface drainage, there is no perennial surface drainage system due to the intrinsic high permeability of the limestone formation which is beneath. There is also artificial drainage features along the access roads to the Long Mountain Country Club, which includes kerb and gutter as well as grilled inlets across the main road.

Here, the diagram clearly indicates, with the proposed site being located here, this is the Mona Reservoir on your right, shows the flow of water from the property in the watershed area, indicating that the flow of water is not towards the dam itself but towards the west, as indicated, down towards the Mountain View Gully.

Here again - first of all, I would like to indicate the drainage flow, and basically we see here, from the property, the natural storm water runoff which comes down towards Long Mountain, towards Pines of Karachi, utilizing the existing drains; these drains then adjoin into the Mountain View Gully and then further continues into the Mountain View Gully. It is also important to highlight here, based on elevational change that the highest point of the ridge is within the property itself, towards the west.

Here, as earlier indicated, the artificial and natural water runoff that will occur. Here we see a spillway. This is an example of a grilled inlet which occurs along the access road, and here we see the natural runoff that

allows the storm water to drain at the foot of Long Mountain, redirecting it towards the Mountain View Gully.

It is important also to note that there is a berm – well in the natural area, there is a berm which naturally prevents the water from running on to the National Water Commission facilities.

With respect to ground water, the dominant perennial drainage, as earlier said, is on the ground. The two limestone formations which occur are the Gibraltar-Bonnygate and Newport Limestone formations. There is significant underground water storage and movement under normal hydrologic conditions and the depth of the ground water is one hundred and three metres (103m) below ground level, as indicated by the nearest well at Beverly Hills.

With respect to natural hazards – the main natural and hydrological hazards which were considered were earthquakes, hurricanes, slope failure, soil erosion, land subsiding and flooding.

With respect to slope failure, the Newport and Rubbly Walderston Limestones are very stable. With respect to erosion, we see that the chalky and nodular forms of the Gibraltar-Bonnygate formation does make it susceptible to erosion by water.

With respect to earthquakes, in January of 1993, there was noted damage to the National Water Commission filter plant, there were ground cracks along the embankment roads on the south western section of the Mona

Reservoir and this triggered rockslides into the limestone corridor located near the reservoir itself.

With respect to flooding – flood susceptibility of the proposed site is very low and this has been confirmed by a July 2011 report done by the ODPEM.

Moving on to the biological – we see that the vegetation is considered degraded dry limestone forest and is clearly exposed to previous levels of degradation. The site is covered by dry land from secondary growth with few emergent trees. It is noted also that the overall tree diversity is low. And the habitat type is woodland or scrub with coppiced trees and the emergent trees are, for example, Red Birch or *Bursera Simaruba* and other common trees include *Acacia Tortuosa*.

Here is a vegetation map indicating that where the proposed site is to be, is degraded forest with a small area of scrub located at the top.

With respect to fauna, a total of twenty-eight bird species were identified and this included eleven (11) endemic species. Eight (8) of these species observed were Jamaican endemic subspecies. The species composition was noted not to be unique to the proposed site and the bird species was noted to be low due to the relatively poor condition of the vegetation. It is noted also that there were no threatened neo-tropical migratory species that winter in the Caribbean known to occur in the proposed development area.

With respect to the heritage – The Jamaica National Heritage Trust in 2010 did a survey and the report indicated that the archeological features and artifact appendages observed near the site were not considered significant to warrant a declaration for preservation.

Moving on to the human and social – with respect to population it was noted that the receptor community was approximately three thousand six hundred and fifty-five (55) persons, based on the 2001 Population Census or represented zero point seven per cent (0.7%) of the over population of St. Andrew.

With respect to social services and amenities, infrastructure - with respect to the housing demand it is noted that there are over twenty-two thousand (22,000) students enrolled between the University of the West Indies and the University of Technology and therefore, because of these educational institutions in the area, there is a unique challenge in terms of housing demand and accommodation.

With respect to traffic, a complete build-out within five (5) years, indicated at approximately fifty-two (52) vehicles during afternoon peak hours would result in less than one (1) vehicle per minute occurring on the road.

And with respect to landscape and visual impact assessment, the small size of the subdivision indicates that the scale of the impact in general is minimal.

The loss of natural vegetation is east of the main road and the visual impact would be to residents in close proximity to the site.

Identification and assessment of direct and indirect impact and mitigation measures – the effect of flooding, the impact and mitigation – storm water flows on the site from Long Mountain Country Club, an adjacent property, could impact the site negatively. The mitigative measures to be undertaken for on-site flooding will be through proposed engineering solutions that have incorporated LEED principles where appropriate. LEED is leadership in energy and environmental design.

With respect to storm water – sorry, offsite storm water from Rutland Drive in Beverly Hills could flow on to the site, but the runoff would be directed to the proposed retention pond; also two spillways that direct flow on to the property will be blocked and an inlet manhole installed with grill cover in the kerb, to alleviate this water.

Here again, indication of the natural runoff of storm water at the foot of Long Mountain, away from national Water Commission facilities.

With respect to the drainage, as earlier stated, the natural depression on the site will be used to deposit eighty per cent (80%) of the storm water generated from the catchment area. The excess water from the retention pond will be contained by a one thousand five hundred millimetre (1500mm) wide and twelve hundred millimetre (1200mm) deep drain

across the main road to an existing drain in the Pines of Karachi to the west of the Mona Reservoir.

This depression will also be a point of infiltration that will effectively recharge the local aquifer.

With respect to land use, the scale of the proposal as indicated before, is eight point four (8.4) hectares and this is guided in terms of land use by the 1966 Kingston & St. Andrew Development Order, based on zoning.

Residual impact –the residual impact assessment with respect to the existing drainage assumes that there will be no direct or indirect impact on existing drainage, except that every possible mitigation measure will be employed to minimize any risk through the design of new drainage structure or the improvement of existing ones.

For the human and social, it is noted that one local residual impact is the increase in traffic flow which, though insignificant on the existing road network the use of Long Mountain and Karachi Roads will reduce any residual impact on the Beverly Hills roadways.

Moving on to cumulative impact – it is noted that one potential cumulative impact of the proposal is the reduction in recharge amounts resulting from the proposed as well as prior development that will impact the long term yield of the production wells that tap the local aquifer.

With respect to monitoring and management, we have tabled here a list of indicators, the target as well as the agency or individual which is responsible. So, as a simple example with respect to solid waste as an indicator, there will be proper and timely disposal of all solid waste including construction waste from the site itself and this would be the responsibility of the NSWMA as well as the developer itself.

In summary, the proposed project lies within the mandate of the HAJ Limited. It is noted that the development will only use nine per cent (9%) of the current land for fifty-one (51) residential lots and the rest will remain as a green area.

A consultative process has been employed. The survey indicated that the percentage of persons who preferred or recommended housing for the area was fifty-eight per cent (58%) in 2010 and this decreased to forty per cent (40%) in 2012.

All five (5) aspects of the environment have been assessed with impact considered and mitigative measures recommended. Residual and cumulative impact have been accounted for, along with suggested monitoring and management framework within the EIA itself.

It is important to note that due diligence has been done throughout this process, as the facts indicate that the project proposal has received approval or no objection letters from the National Environmental Planning Agency, primary partners, and these have been listed below, such as

National Water Commission, the Mines and Geology Division, the ODPEM as well as the Water Resources Authority.

I thank you for listening.

(Applause)

CHAIRMAN: Ladies and gentlemen, for the benefit of those who came in late or those with short memories like myself, let me just reiterate, we will entertain questions one at a time. Questions should be posed at the microphone, questions must be posed to the Chairman. Questions must not take longer than three minutes; they can be serialized, segmented, complicated, simple, but they mustn't take longer than three minutes. One follow up question will be allowed after the response and the response will be given by one of the consultants or the appropriate person who can answer the question.

There is a court reporter. I am therefore asking that you speak slowly and clearly. The purpose of this session is to capture your concerns, your complaints, your criticisms. It is not necessarily to allow editorializing on general issues.

No repeat questioning by any one person will be allowed, until all others have been satisfied and questions will go by rote. I am asking that we maintain proper rules of order and be civil to each other.

You may approach the microphone - stand to be recognized, approach the microphone. The person at the microphone poses their question, the next person standing that I recognize will be allowed to ask their question. You are to state your name and your connection before you have asked your question. All questions must come through the Chairman.

Thank you. I recognize this lady

MS. C. COOPER: I'm Carolyn Cooper and my interest is as a resident of the adjacent area. I want to raise a question about the claim in the second to last slide or the last slide, that the National Water Commission has given its approval for the project. I quote from Page 18 of the report where some of the clear concerns are identified,

“With respect to HAJ proposal discussions have included:

1. The Long Mountain is the watershed area for the Mona Dam....”

CHAIRMAN: Can you slow down for me?

MS. COOPER: Well, I'm trying to ask my question within the three minutes which I am allowed.

CHAIRMAN: It's all right. I will allow some latitude on that question.

MS. COOPER: Thank you.

“..The Long Mountain is the watershed area for the Mona Dam,

Discharge of additional storm water into the drainage channel could erode the lower slopes facing the reservoir

Sewage from the proposed development entering the Mona Reservoir

The need to assess the potential impact of the proposal with respect to the reservoir and the potable water supply, wild life and solid waste.

The above assertions have now been corroborated by the NWC, see NWC Approval letter in Appendix 16.3.”

However, when you turn to the Appendix, it is clear that the National Water Commission has given no approval. The letter that is there attached, I don't know if anybody who wrote the assessment read the letter, but the letter under the signature of Franklyn T. Williams, Chief Engineer, Senior Vice President of the National Water Commission, dated October 22, 2009 and headed “without prejudice” states:

“Notwithstanding the foregoing, it must be understood that this letter does not constitute an NWC approval. Such approval must be endorsed by the President and the Chairman.

With regard to your request to the NWC to provide its comments with regard to the proposed project in relation to the Mona Reservoir the Commission, at this time, would be concerned with the matter of storm water runoff as it relates to possible flooding of our existing Mona Water Treatment Plant.”

So my question to you, Chair, is how do the writers of this assessment explain the disparity between their claim that the National Water Commission has approved the project and the

Water Commission's own statement that it has not approved the project and in fact has concerns for water runoff.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Response? HAJ?

MRS. SMITH BROWN: There is a letter here in the report dated February 16, 2012 that says,

“Having received the sewage and water layout drainage design for the for the proposed HAJ subdivision at Mona Section I, the National Water Commission offers no objection to approval for the development. We further add that the Mona Reservoir Treatment Plant will not be affected by the development.”

CHAIRMAN: One clarificatory question.

MS. COOPER: Could you clarify the basis on which the Water Commission has changed its mind? What is the evidence on which the document that you supplied is now being seen as relevant and you read another letter that is not in the document for us to review.

MS. BROWN SMITH: The letter is actually in the document; the revised version.

MS. COOPER: On what page?

MS. SMITH BOWN: Page 113.

MS. COOPER: So why did you refer to the document I read, if there is another one that supports your claim?

CHAIRMAN: Can I just make a point? That is a valid question and if there is a procedural reference or procedural correction that you need to make, it should be made now. And all the participants here this evening refer to that particular letter if they have not seen it already.

MS. BROWN SMITH: I'm not sure exactly what response I am to make here, but be that as it may, NWC - I don't think there is anyone represented here but we can only refer to the last communication with them with respect to the development.

CHAIRMAN: What you are saying is that their letter was in fact recorded and is on the record, subsequent to the letter referred to?

MS. BROWN SMITH: (Nods).

CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you. Next.

MS. COOPER: But is it in the document? Is it available for us to look at?

MS. BROWN SMITH: Yes, it is in the EIA.

MS. COOPER: On what page?

CHAIRMAN: She did say the page.

MS. COOPER: It is not on page 113.

PARTICIPANT Page 130; Page 130.

CHAIRMAN: I will bring an end to that particular issue.

Go ahead.

MS. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, Jennifer Rowe, I am a resident on the Karachi side. Assuming that the project is going ahead as planned, not necessarily supporting that, but assuming that, I notice traffic being sent through the Karachi side. At present, and I am not sure if any recognition has been taken of it, the Mona Road is almost impassable when rain falls. I am not talking about flood or hurricane, I am talking about rain. Even getting into Karachi is a major problem.

What is being taken into account of Mona Road with clearing of traffic and any emergency evacuation, should it be necessary?

CHAIRMAN: Response? Is there anybody to respond to that?

MS. BROWN SMITH: We are not aware of any measures being taken. I think the focus was on the actual development area.

CHAIRMAN: Miss Rowe, do you have a clarificatory question?

MISS ROWE: I would just ask that it be noted.

MS. McCAULAY: Mr. Chairman, I have a quick question. Would you please introduce the people at the Head Table.

CHAIRMAN: I can't.

MS. McCAULAY: You can't? Well, can they introduce themselves?

CHAIRMAN: Valid point. When you are responding give your name and your connection as I had said earlier.

MS. McCAULAY: You think it will come?

CHAIRMAN: I think it is appropriate.

PARTICIPANT: It is important to know what...

CHAIRMAN: Hold on, hold on, calm down. Could you repeat what you were saying, sir?

PARTICIPANT: No, I was saying they could introduce themselves, because we can pose some questions depending on the particular person.

CHAIRMAN: All right, fine. Introduce yourselves, please.

MS. BROWN SMITH: Beverline Brown Smith, EPN Consultant Limited.

MR. BROWN: Barry Brown, Consulting Engineer to EPN Consultants.

MR. BEAL: Marlon Beal, Consultant, working with EPN.

MS. McCAULAY: Thank you.

My comment really is for the National Environment & Planning Agency. I think the presentation did not reflect what is actually written in the EIA. Because of the timeframe I am going to give you two examples. For instance Mr. Beal mentioned the zoning

issue without stating that the plan being proposed for development is designated as a conservation area green space according to Town and Country Planning Authority, Kingston Development Order 1966...” he actually goes on to make a case that “***while general zoning has been established for Long Mountain, there are other land uses which do not comply***” and it makes the case that because there have been other breaches, further breaches should continue. But Mr. Beal’s presentation did not go into any of that. So anyone who is sitting in this room thinking that that presentation is accurately reflecting what is actually written in the document is mistaken and I do not think NEPA should allow that.

The second example I am going to give, and I could give many but you are going to constrain me, is on the question of seismic instability. Mr. Beal moved quickly over that. However, in the EIA it says,

“This development will be located 500 metres from an active fault zone and will be girded by two more fault structures. The area is prone to potentially dangerous and damaging seismic events...”

That’s Page 26,

Local rock formations exhibit numerous fractures and brecciation, according to the computation of the geologist, for these fault structures.

Earthquake sources in the Blue Mountain region are only 8 kilometre radius from the project site. This coupled with the presence of faults and fracture zones in the project area make the general

area susceptible to experiencing the effects of moderate to severe earthquake events.

Earthquakes and other manmade disturbances from construction may result in differential settlement and collapse of large cavities.”

So the EIA itself actually outlines quite serious scientific events not represented in that presentation. There are very many issues with the EIA that I do not think I am going to be able to stand up here and raise.

I would say I was very disappointed to see the lack of improvement over the first effort and I guess the last thing I would - we will send all these in writing, but I do not think NEPA should allow that glossing over of the issues that are stated and unstated in the EIA.

A degraded forest, ladies and gentlemen, can be restored, can come back over time. Once it is covered with houses, there is no going back.

(Applause)

And that is what really we are being told that ‘oh, it is kinda mashed up, we dun mek some bad mistakes in the past, but we should continue on that road.’

I also want to know finally, what is the position of the National Environment & Planning Agency, now under the Ministry of Land

Water Environment and Climate Change, about the taking out of the large areas of, even admittedly, degraded forest.

(Applause)

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Do we have a response from the consultants?

MS. BROWN SMITH: The question was directed to NEPA.

CHAIRMAN: Is there a representative from NEPA here who could respond to that? Let it be noted that the question is not responded to by NEPA. We don't know if they are present or not but they are not responding to us.

MR. HENRY: NEPA is not present to answer any questions.

CHAIRMAN: Pardon me?

MR. HENRY: The representative from NEPA clearly stated that we are not here to answer questions...

CHAIRMAN: Can you approach the mike for me so that we can get it in the record. Sorry. Go ahead. Name?

MR. HENRY: Ainsley Henry, Director of Applications Management at NEPA. As the representative earlier stated, we are not here to answer questions today, we are here to listen to the comments, to the

concerns being raised and to make a note of them, not to respond to them.

CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you. Yes, ma'am?

MS. KING: My name is Sonia King, a Beverly Hills resident. I was absolutely amazed that none of your respondents showed any concerns about the water source being contaminated from all the environmental problems. Water was not one of the issues that came up and in my community that is one of our major issues.

On the map that you kept showing, you said that the runoff from the development would be going away from the dam, but then you spoke about natural hazards and earthquakes and hurricanes. We know what can happen there and I mean a backflow into the dam would seriously affect our water source. That is just a point. I am just wondering where did you take your questionnaire? Because certainly it wasn't in my area, because nobody expressed a concern about a major thing; water is life. I don't understand. I am just confused, so I'm just putting that out there. All right.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

A response to that? Presumably the basis of your survey, the structure of the survey.

MR. BROWN: Barry Brown. There really should be no concern about water getting over into the dam. The dam structure is higher than the surrounding property. There is also an additional berm that is built to protect all NWC's facilities. Even if the berm is damaged, the water cannot reach inside the dam. It is as simple as that.

CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MS. P. COOPER SHAND: I'm Pearline Cooper Shand from the Pines of Karachi and based on the responses you got from your survey, no one from the Pines of Karachi was a part of your sample. No one could have given you any positive answer.

But first I want to establish that the Pines of Karachi is not averse to any housing solution. We are not. But at this time we are reeling from the impact of a nearby housing development. And I see here in an October 11 letter from Mr. Shoucair where he acknowledges all the problems that we have at the Pines of Karachi. Some of them are oblivious even to the development from which they occurred.

From a Powerpoint presentation, I saw where the sewage was going to be joined to us. I see where a developer said that it would create a stink. But as I said to NEPA, no other stink can be created than what we experience at this time, on a daily basis at the Pines of Karachi.

I also see where the Pines of Karachi will be the major corridor. I am saying that that has been maintained by us over the past decade and it is only because of this development that Mr. Shoucair has said that the Housing Agency owns the roads.

We fix the roads, we buy our street lights, we buy our street signs and the only way he can claim that road now is if he pays us retroactively for all that we have done to that road. It is just now that he is claiming and over a decade that road has been maintained by us.

In terms of traffic, where you say one per minute; one per minute! We cannot even walk on that road, morning and evening, not only due to the number of motor vehicles, but to the speed. We cannot walk on that road at all. We don't send our children even to next door, for fear of losing them.

So, again, I was told that the sewage would be joined to the Pines of Karachi. Right now, it is not only the sewage that we are having a problem with from Long Mountain, but from the Mona Great House where we are experiencing not only stench, but raw sewage in our major canal. We can take no other burden, no other burden.

Traffic - there was an idea to put the traffic down to the netball field, we would appreciate if that could be in the system. Because based on what I have heard now, everything is positive about this

development, therefore we are to now think of how it is going to impact us...

CHAIRMAN: Twenty seconds warning.

MS. P. COOPER SHAND: Twenty seconds left?

CHAIRMAN: Twenty seconds.

MS. P. COOPER SHAND: Well, I will come back at the end of everybody else because I have a mammoth thing to say. All I want to end by saying is that we are not against housing solutions but right now we are reeking with the effects of nearby developments. Sewage, storm drains, roads, you name it, and that's the Pines. We seem to be the receptacle for waste.

(Applause)

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Do you want to make a response to that?

I have allowed you a certain amount of latitude in the statements because clearly we cannot restrict ourselves to naked questions. There must be some context, but again I say we don't want this to degenerate into statements of broad policy. We can allow for complaints, concerns, but what we are trying to do is to register the feeling of the public concern to this development. That is the context within which I am trying to operate.

Do you have a response to that series of concerns that was raised?

MS. BROWN SMITH: I think they were raised at the last public presentation and that was left for the Housing Agency of Jamaica to address.

CHAIRMAN: Is everybody hearing?

PARTICIPANT: No, we are not hearing.

CHAIRMAN: That microphone is working.

MS. BROWN SMITH: What I was saying is that those concerns were raised at the last public presentation and Housing Agency made an observation, I think, “will be addressing those concerns.”

CHAIRMAN: One clarificatory comment or question, one.

MS. COOPER SHAND: Mr. Shoucair, “we must take responsibility for these issues.” But why I am repeating them, madam, is that based on what was reported by this gentleman, it is gone.

MR. BROWN: May I?

(Cross talk)

CHAIRMAN: Can we have one meeting, please.

MR. BROWN: I don't think that decision has been made and nobody said that decision has been made. What I would strongly recommend is

your particular set of problems you are having, please put them in writing.

MS. P. COOPER SHAND: We have an encyclopedia of that.

MR. BROWN: Let them have it at the Agency.

MS. P. COOPER SHAND: Again?

MR. BROWN: Yes, again.

CHAIRMAN: All right. No, no, I will not allow a general argument. The point is, you are putting them in writing, he says do it again. I am not sure of the reasonableness of that but the fact is that it is recorded that you have said that you have put it in writing.

MS. P. COOPER SHAND: Several times.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, ma'am.

MS. MORRISON: I'm Shan Morrison and I'm a Beverly Hills resident. My concerns are two: first of all is this just a plain subdivision or is there a developer that is going to do the development?

CHAIRMAN: That's the whole question?

MS. MORRISON: No.

CHAIRMAN: That one is noted, you will get a response. Go on.

MS. MORRISON: The other thing is, who is going to undertake these mitigation measures that sound so good in the presentation here? Who is going to undertake the mitigation and the drainage measures? That is what I would like to know because right now as the lady says they are being subjected to this nastiness of sewage and the rest of it and nobody seems to do anything about it, no matter how much they complain and no matter how long it is that they are complaining, and you just complain and complain and you stay with your complaints I suppose, until you can't complain any more.

(Applause)

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

The question, for your recollection is, who is the developer, who is going to be responsible for the development and also who is responsible for the mitigation measures?

MS. BROWN SMITH: The proposal is for service lots, so the development will be gradual based on who proceeds with their development.

MS. MORRISON: You mean who buys in?

MS. BROWN SMITH: Exactly.

CHAIRMAN: And the responsibility for mitigation – you had a chart with a list of names of people that would be responsible.

MS. BROWN SMITH: Besides the chart, there is also – if a permit is granted NEPA would include conditions which NEPA, I am sure, would monitor to ensure that those are upheld.

CHAIRMAN: Okay. Sir?

MR. E. DAWKINS: Good evening. My name is Earl Dawkins, just public interest. Two questions: the lots will be sold as lots and concerning the sewer, you said it is attached to the central sewer. Does this mean that it ends up downtown? Where is it actually treated?

MR. BROWN: It will go to the treatment system that now exists for the line going down Hope Road. The sewage from this site will end up at the pumping station at Karachi and all of the sewage that is collected in that area will be pumped to the general NWC sewage system. So it will not be treated anywhere in the area.

MR. E. DAWKINS: You are saying that there is a treatment facility in Karachi?

MR. BROWN: No.

CHAIRMAN: May I remind you that questions must be put through the Chair. If you have a clarificatory question you can go ahead and ask it, but it must be through me.

MR. E. DAWKINS: Yes, man, that's through you; him answer it before him mek you hear it.

So the question... well, go ahead.

MR. BROWN: At present all the sewage that's collected by NWC...

MR. E. DAWKINS: No, from the scheme.

MR. BROWN: No. ... in the general area of Karachi, Liguanea, *et cetera*, goes to a central sewage treatment area. This project will add to that system. The sewage will be collected and sent to the pumping station that now exist at Karachi and it will just pump it, as all the other sewage collected there, to the treatment system.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS. WILLIAMS: Good evening, my name is Fayval Williams, my connection here is that I am a Beverly Hills resident.

At the last public meeting that was held, I raised the question or the issue about the number of people who were interviewed in terms of the charts that were put up, and at the time the number was something like forty people or thereabout, were interview. Given that you have updated this study, can you say how many were there additional people who were interviewed and where do those people live?

CHAIRMAN: Can you speak to the metrics of the study?

MS. BROWN SMITH: If you noticed from the presentation this came from Mona Heights...

CHAIRMAN: Can we have one meeting, please.

MS. BROWN SMITH: I'm sorry, Blue Castle Drive, Wellington Drive, Beverly Hills, Pines of Karachi, Hope Dale Avenue, Glenview. Those are the EDs, the communities within those EDs: 35, 36, 38 39, 46, 47...

CHAIRMAN: It is necessary for all of us to hear... just a minute... if there is a dispute with the response, hold the dispute and frame it in the form of a question.

Go ahead.

MS. WILLIAMS: I'm sorry, I did not hear the number of people she said.

MS. BROWN SMITH: The number of persons, fifty-four (54)

(Laughter)

MS. WILLIAMS: Well, do you think it is appropriate to include people from as far away as Mona Heights in the survey and use that as the basis for saying forty per cent (40%) or fifty per cent (50%) of the people agree to housing on that site?

MS. BROWN SMITH: Because we are using a radius of one point five kilometres (1.5km), we are talking about the receptor communities, we had to include everybody.

MS. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman, may I ask another question? In the summary part of your report, there is a statement that is made that the developer is saying that they will only develop nine per cent (9%) of some over two hundred (200) acres of land that is there and it says the

remaining ninety-one per cent (91%) would remain conservation and public open space.

On what authority do you put that in the report and is it there to make it seem as if there is a nice trade off here to be done?

MS. BROWN SMITH: Well, I'm basically relating what the developer indicated.

CHAIRMAN: In other words, it is a commitment by the developers.

PARTICIPANTS: Can't hear, use the mike.

MS. BROWN SMITH: I was saying that this is information conveyed to us by the developer. They own the property, so they indicated that they will be developing that portion and maintain the rest as green space.

MS. WILLIAMS: So it's just the developer's word?

PARTICIPANT: Who is the developer?

CHAIRMAN: No, no, sorry, you have to wait.

MS. WILLIAMS: Could you state the name of the developer?

MS. BROWN SMITH: The developer is the Housing Agency of Jamaica.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Next – sorry. You first and then this lady.

MS. ANDRADE: Daniel Andrade, Jamaica Environment Trust. I just wanted to follow on, on what Fayval said with a clarification. I read the EIA and it was fifty-two (52) people who were surveyed; thirty-one

(31) of the fifty-two (52) people were from the Mona Heights region.

(Laughter)

I just thought the people, since it was raised, should be mentioned.

I have an issue about – a concern about the storm water runoff and possible contamination of the underground aquifer. I would love to hear from you, what are your plans to deal with pollution, not just sediment control, nutrients now, which natural filtration will not stop. I want to hear more about that.

The other thing I wanted to talk about, you said in the presentation that '*there is no known migratory birds that winter in the area.*'

MR. BEAL: I said there were no '*...threatened...*'

MS. ANDRADE: No threatened migratory birds. I have a concern that you only did a survey over two days in the summer...

MR. BEAL: No.

MS. ANDRADE: ...is it?

MR. BEAL: No.

CHAIRMAN: So, it's three questions, is it? One relating to the adequacy of the survey...

MS. ANDRADE: The adequacy of the survey and also...

CHAIRMAN: The drainage...

MS. ANDRADE: What are the detailed design plans to prevent water contamination from the storm water runoff, and then the third question I had was in relation to your assessment of the migratory birds in that area.

CHAIRMAN: Can I have a response to those three issues.

MS. BROWN SMITH: Well, the survey segment was taken equally from each ED. So if it means that the weight was away from Beverly Hills, it simply means that most of the population is away from Beverly Hills; most of the population in the sample. So it was as simple as that.

CHAIRMAN: You are going to have to try and speak up for me.

MS. BROWN SMITH: It just has to do with the distribution of the population in the area. It had nothing to do with the survey. It's just what the population is. The population came from the survey segment, the survey sample came from the distribution of the population in the area, based on the 2001 Census.

CHAIRMAN: We cannot allow the cross talk.

MS. BROWN SMITH: Yes, Long Mountain of course was included. Everyone living in the area was included.

CHAIRMAN: All right, there are two other segments to the question.

MR. BEAL: With respect to the neo-tropical migratory species, as stated in the presentation, it's the threatened migratory species. The report indicated that there are several neo-tropical migratory species that utilise the area.

With respect to the timeline for the survey, I agree that the initial survey was done across two days. Also taken into consideration was historical data, through surveys conducted by other groups such as Birdlife Jamaica, other university students that have done past surveys within the area itself. Those were considered in respect to determining whether or not threatened neo-tropical migratory species utilized the habitat itself.

CHAIRMAN: You first, then you, ma'am.

PARTICIPANT: There was a third part to the question.

CHAIRMAN: Pardon me?

PARTICIPANT: There was a third part to the question.

CHAIRMAN: What was the third part?

PARTICIPANT: Water quality.

CHAIRMAN: Oh, yes, sorry. There was a third part to the question relating to the ground water pollution, I think. Is there a response?

MR. BROWN: To my mind, the nutrients from runoff would be similar to all the areas that are there. The only difference is that we are having an infiltration basin, which would be different from anywhere else in the area, for eighty per cent (80%) of the flow plus flows from offsite. The other twenty per cent (20%) would be running rapidly down the gully into the formal drainage system.

I don't see how we can remove nutrients from storm water at this point. I don't see how we can do that.

MS. ANDRADE: There are other pollutants.

MR. BROWN: There are no other pollutants apart from rubber...

CHAIRMAN: If you have a question, approach the microphone – a follow up question is allowed - so that we can record it properly and not just have crosstalk which is not captured on the record. If you have a follow up question, let's hear it.

MS. McCAULAY: Mr. Chairman, I want to pose a question.

CHAIRMAN: Not yet.

MS. McCAULAY: When?

CHAIRMAN: You can pose it through her. You can't pose it, you have asked. You will have to wait until everybody else...

MS. McCAULAY: I don't think it is appropriate, right...

CHAIRMAN: I can't hear you.

MS. McCAULAY: We have a question about birds, a question was asked about birds. Mr. Beal has answered the question, but I think his answer is inadequate right and I...

CHAIRMAN: It could, it could, but hold on, this is not a judgement you know, it's a hearing. So it will be recorded.

MS. McCAULAY: Okay. Let me just...

CHAIRMAN: Just let me finish.

MS. McCAULAY: Let me just say what I'm saying and then you can finish.

CHAIRMAN: No, let me just respond to that.

MS. McCAULAY: I'm dealing with the bird thing...

CHAIRMAN: Diana, I hear what you are saying, the question was fulsome, the answer may have been inadequate. But it is not for us here - unless you have a follow up question to draw out more adequacies, I will not entertain a debate on the adequacy of the question, because it is recorded and it will be obvious to see.

MS. McCAULAY: But you are not hearing what I am saying.

CHAIRMAN: That's correct because you are not at the mike.

MS. McCAULAY: Will that solve the problem? What I am trying to say, sir, is that these are sort of issue related stuff. We are dealing with birds, right, we have a question from Daniel. Marlon has answered it and I feel we should wrap up the bird issue before we move on now to the storm water and the drain.

CHAIRMAN: But you thrash it out by her asking a follow up question.

MS. McCAULAY: It's not her follow up question now, it's mine.

CHAIRMAN: No, but it can't be yours because you asked your question already.

MS. McCAULAY: So I have to wait for everybody and then start back on the birds. That's all I'm saying.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, you will have to do that, because that is the only way that I can ensure....

MS. McCAULAY: I think that's a bad process so I want that on the record also.

CHAIRMAN: It's the only way that I can ensure some democracy because there are some other concerns here other than birds.

Yes, ma'am

MS. WEST: Mr. Chairman, my name is Elaine West, I am from Pines of Karachi. I know that National Housing Development, they are the developers. But it was also stated that individual service lots would be built by individuals. How sensible is that in terms of a

development? I can't see the logic in it, because people will do what they want to do and it does not necessarily follow that there will be any kind of monitoring by the various agencies.

We have seen that happening in Karachi and other places and I don't think - it's my opinion that this might not be a good situation. They are not going to develop the housing. They are going to give people to do as they want to do and it might not follow the rules and regulations that are to be followed.

The other part of the question is that the gentleman over there says that a sewage development plant will be lodged in Karachi, it's not there. You know that is very bizarre. Have they or are they supposed to check with the citizens of that development to ensure that they approve or agree that a sewage development plant should be lodged in that part of the community.

We also have a dissipating tank from Long Mountain placed in Karachi. We were not told that that was going to be there. And so they can't keep dumping things on a part of the citizenry and we have no voice.

Where do we go from here? After this meeting, what happens to all the information that flows from this meeting? Will the housing developer be able to continue or are they going to just make a decision and go ahead and sell and get people to develop? I don't

think it is safe and I don't think the citizenry agrees with what is happening.

PARTICIPANT: Mr. Chairman...

CHAIRMAN: Just a minute.

PARTICIPANT: ...can I say something about that....

CHAIRMAN: Well, what I wanted to do is capture the essence of what the lady has said as it relates, and correct me if I am wrong, to the enforceability of these particular provisions against people who buy lots. That's one. Two: there is an issue, as I recall you were saying regarding the sewage disposal or the sewage treatment that was not consented to, right. And there was a third segment, I think she expressed a concern about the general development of the area without the people expressing their consent.

MS. P. COOPER SHAND: Yes, sir, may I be privileged to...in a document written by Robert Cartade, developer of Long Mountain, he said, "***it would be difficult to interrupt the sewage system without causing a literal stink at the Pines of Karachi.***" The same thing that they have said they are going to add their thing to. I just want to underscore...

CHAIRMAN: You are emphasizing the concern relating to the disposal of sewage?

MS. P. COOPER SHAND: Yes. And he said, “*from there, it is gravity fed from Pines of Karachi and it cannot be interrupted.*” This is in here. I have the Gleaner.

CHAIRMAN: Before that lady asks her question, is there a response from the consultants?

MR. BROWN: I don’t think there is any intention of interrupting the gravity flow from the...

(Cross talk)

CHAIRMAN: Allow him to respond.

MR. BROWN: Any concerns like that from the developer, is something that can be addressed.

PARTICIPANT: You should address now.

CHAIRMAN: Allow him to finish.

MR. BROWN: No, no; that can be addressed. The additional amount of sewage coming from the development into your system should not cause a stink. You are not keeping sewage...

PARTICIPANT: That is not the point.

MR. BROWN: It is the point.

CHAIRMAN: I am going to ask that you do not do that because that is rude. We have a response. Wait until he is finished. Look, what we are trying to do here is to point out these concerns and have them recorded. Not to get into a cass cass and a whole debate about it, because this is not the place for it. And the response to the lady's question which I forgot, after this process, as I understand it, these concerns are recorded and they are sent to HAJ or wherever for the public to look at and you have thirty (30) days within which to make written submission.

There is a process. If we can follow the process - the process may be flawed - but if we follow the process we'll get a little further than trying to argue in this room which would get us nowhere. All I want to do is ensure that your concerns are properly recorded in a civil and disciplined fashion.

PARTICIPANT: All right....

CHAIRMAN: Just a minute... I can't hear you, sir, you're not standing. There is a lady at the microphone.

PARTICIPANT: No man, no man, go along.

Are you finished, sir?

MR. BROWN: No, no. All the sewage from this development will quickly reach the holding area that's on the site, not Karachi, the holding site in

the development that is being proposed. It will not stay there long enough to start having any odour problems.

PARTICIPANT: *(Sotto voce comment)*

MR. BROWN: You can't tell me it's not true.

CHAIRMAN: This lady has been waiting long.

The answer is recorded. There is a difference of opinion which has been recorded. The consultant says that it will not be so treated, and there won't be a stench and that is recorded.

Yes, ma'am.

MS. McCAULAY: Can I say something?

MS. WILMOT: My name is Merle Wilmot.

CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry. You may after this lady has asked her question and gotten a response. She has been waiting.

MS. WILMOT: My name is Merle Wilmot from Pines of Karachi. I wonder why the 2001 Population Census was used, and I ask the question to say this, the Pines of Karachi population commenced in 2002; from 2002 onwards.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN: Sorry to interrupt you, ma'am, but I just want to underscore the importance of hearing from everyone. That is a very valid point that needs to be recorded. Thank you.

(Soto voce comment)

No, he did stand up first. Yes, sir.

MR. S. DAWKINS: I'm Stephen Dawkins... oh, you're going to respond?

CHAIRMAN: Oh, I'm sorry; my fault, not yours.

MS. BROWN SMITH: I'm not sure what would be the recommendation because normally when we do these survey studies, the only reference we have is the last census. The last census was 2001. So, if the Pines of Karachi was not developed then we would say that there was a population because seven hundred and seventeen (717) persons were recorded in the general area; might not have been Pines of Karachi but it would have been Karachi Avenue.

PARTICIPANT: No, no.

MS. BROWN SMITH: I'm not sure, but anyway, there are seven hundred and seventeen (717) persons recorded in that ED.

MS. WILMOT: Because I know that you can always get an update from the Statistical Department on population if you need information for anything. A population census was done last year too, although it has not been published yet. But I still think that for us to have

been left out and we are going to be directly affected by what is happening, because nobody in Pines of Karachi was ever interviewed in this...

MS. BROWN SMITH: That is not true.

CHAIRMAN: Sir....

(Soto voce comments)

Order, please. Can we have some order; order please. Thank you

MR. S. DAWKINS: Stephen Dawkins, I am the Chairperson of the Board of Directors for the most controversial community, Long Mountain Country Club.

Again, at the last meeting we had I had expressed some concerns and I came in late, didn't see the entire presentation, but one of the concerns is what Pearline expressed, the sewage system, because I am very close to that and there is sewage system going down as per Mr. Cartade, any addition to that will burst open, sewage will start coming up into our homes.

Secondly, the roads, the moment that that road – that road was not built to take any additional development and any development going towards that road right now will destroy that road.

The concerns coming out of Long Mountain Country Club, apart from the environmental issue is the subdivision issues that are

raised. They think that the subdivision and not a development per say will destroy the entire area and community.

Of course there are a number of other questions, but I will just raise those three points for now. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Response?

MR. BROWN: To my certain knowledge, the gravity flow from the energy dissipating manhole, all the way back to the pumping station is adequate for what is being planned.

The odour problem that is being mentioned is a problem that exists at the moment, as is being expressed here, and is something that should be looked at further, why you are still having that odour problem. But this is the point, it has to be mitigated. It is not something that is going to be just left up in the air like that.

CHAIRMAN: Mitigation will be a precondition, you're saying, of going forward.

MR. BROWN: But it should.

MS. C. COOPER: Carolyn Cooper, again. I wanted to respond to the question about the sewage being collected on the site and there will be no problem.

An earlier environmental assessment, way, way in the past, that has been completely disregarded because it doesn't suit the people who want to run ahead with the development, suggested that

because of the nature of the selling of individual lots, there will be no control over the rate of development and one of the problems with that is that there may not be enough sewage collected in the earlier phase of development to even move down the road. So the whole sewage system will be constipated.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN: No editorial – you are editorializing.

MS. C. COOPER: I am just speaking metaphorically. So, in fact, the claim that the sewage on the site is going to move freely is not accurate because the earlier environmental assessment pointed out the problem of uneven development. So that is one big point. And I just want to tag on my concern about the number of people cited that you looked at in the survey. When you use the 2001 figures, it makes the proportion that is interviewed look much bigger than it would if you were to use a much larger database, because communities must have at least – maybe not doubled but at least fifty per cent (50%) more people in a decade. So it makes it look even worse if it's only fifty (50) people you talk to. I do not know how in clear conscience you could come to us and say that you have interviewed fifty (50) people on a matter of such grave concern for the people in the immediate community and also for the people in the larger Kingston Metropolitan area.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, thank you.

How you going to move from sewage to the berm?

MR. BROWN: Right. Let me just comment on inadequate sewage flows. In most of these subdivisions that are designed as lots, one thing you will never hear complained about is an odour problem. You can tell me of any subdivision that people have complained about an odour problem when you have development that is not seeded? When you have lots...

CHAIRMAN: Let me say that responders are not allowed to pose questions and I will not entertain an answer.

MR. E. DAWKINS: I was about to answer.

CHAIRMAN: No, you can ask a question in your turn. It was a rhetorical question.

MR. BROWN: ...It does not happen. This subdivision, whatever sewage reaches down into the collection area for pumping, is by regulation limited to a certain period of time in terms of when you pump from it, and that period of time does not allow it to get septic so it will smell; does not allow it to get septic so it will smell. The regulations do not allow it. So you can't design a containment area that it is so large that it would give you the problem of odour.

CHAIRMAN: That gentleman after Diana and then you, in order.

(Soto voce comment)

CHAIRMAN: No, but he is responding to Miss Cooper because it is her question.

MS. C. COOPER: What can I say?

CHAIRMAN: No, no, if you have a further question you are allowed to ask one further question.

MS. C. COOPER: The further question is, on what basis are you claiming that the statement that I made coming out of the earlier assessment is inaccurate, where it says that uneven development is going to create sewage problem. On what basis are you saying that that assessment is inaccurate?

MR. BROWN: My forty-odd years of experience.

MS. C. COOPER: That is no comfort.

MR. BROWN: I'm not giving you comfort, ma'am.

CHAIRMAN: The question was asked and the answer was given. Thank you.

Diana.

MS. C. COOPER: So why is the problem in Karachi of stench....

CHAIRMAN: No, ma'am, I won't hear you. I won't hear you.

MS. McCAULAY:

The problem, Mr. Chairman, is that everybody has experience of inadequate regulations so these assurances that we are hearing, we all know is empty noise.

The question of birds is another example of the glossing over that is being done here today. When – and remember this is the environmental impact assessment – I know there are many other concerns, but really, we are here to talk about environmental impact. So on the question of the birds, Mr. Beal says he said there were no threatened migratory species, as if we should all go, oh, well, that's fine then, no threatened migratory species. But this is the process by which birds become threatened because they take out their habitat and they don't have it and that is how they become threatened.

So, simply to say oh, it is some non-threatened ones that we are going to affect, you have been giving the wrong impression and it should not be allowed.

These, the TORs, the Terms of Reference issued by NEPA requires a description of the environmental significance of the location in its broader context, which would include the fact that Jamaica has a large amount of endemic birds and migration. The EIA says the study area supports no less than thirty-nine per cent (39%) of Jamaica's extant endemic bird species.

Now, is anybody sitting in this room going to get that impression from what is being said here? It should not be allowed. It further says...

CHAIRMAN: It is not being allowed, you are recording the contrary.

MS McCAULAY: It's being allowed though, *"The EIA included historical data that suggested the possibility of at least six (6) species of neo-tropical migratory species in the development area,"* these are strong evidence of the environmental significance of the location. An environmental impact consultant is the person who should stand up to defend the environmental aspect of the area. They are sounding like the Housing Authority of Jamaica.

(Applause)

That is why this process is wrong.

CHAIRMAN: I hear you. I take it you are criticizing the study, not the person, because I cannot entertain that.

MS. McCAULAY: No, I'm criticizing the study and the presentation that we heard.

CHAIRMAN: Okay, fine.

MS. McCAULAY: And I am saying the reason we are here, sir, you said it was not to argue and stuff, but in fact it is. The reason we are here is to hear what are the environmental impact of what is proposed, to hear them honestly and frankly from professionals in the field. We

should not be here listening to a sales pitch from the Housing Authority of Jamaica and all these empty assurances.

These are the people that we should rely on to tell us the truth about forest and birds and sewage, instead of which they are glossing over what is actually their own document, really hoping and praying that nobody is going to read it.

So I have recorded that, okay? I think this process is not correct and I again call on the National Environment and Planning Agency to have the Environmental Consultants say what is in their EIA.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

(Applause)

Is there a response? You have asked a question, let her respond.

MS. BROWN SMITH: There is a time constraint...

CHAIRMAN: Hold on.

(Paper change)

MS. BROWN SMITH: There's a time constraint with presentations, and Miss McCaulay, as you have correctly done and mentioned, you have read the document and you know what is in the document and you have indicated what is there. We could not possibly present everything

that is in the document in this presentation so you have brought the rest of the information to the fore, and that is okay.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, ma'am.

MS. P. COOPER SHAND: Because we are now haunted by the sewage and the stench, this gentleman says that there should not have been a stench. I would like to ask him why is there a stench and secondly I want to ask why is it now, only now going to be addressed because of your interest in the proposed Mona, and thirdly I am going to say to you that if you go there right now you'll see where a prospective resident started a building and could not finish it because he could never stay there and a 'for sale' has been up there permanently. Every young child who passes there knows how to spell for sale because they see it every day, every day.

Why is the stench at Pines of Karachi? And the person who put the stench there say you shouldn't touch it at all, okay. So, why is it now going to be rectified only just now, after we have been living there with the stench for over a decade?

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Response?

MR. BROWN: Frankly, I can't imagine why your problem has not been solved. I am not a party to that problem. I am saying that our development will not cause any stench problem in...

MS. C. COOPER: Our development? Our development?

CHAIRMAN: No, no, no, allow him to finish his response...

MS. C. COOPER: No, sir, our development?

CHAIRMAN: Ma'am, I am saying you can rebut, you cannot interrupt.

MR. BROWN: My apologies for...

MS. C. COOPER: It is a clear conflict of interest.

MR. BROWN: My apologies. My words...

MS. C. COOPER: It's a Freudian slip of the greatest proportion...

CHAIRMAN: Miss Cooper, I will not allow you to speak from the floor like that. I will not allow it. Just a minute. For the record, an hour has passed. I am extending this out of consideration for the concerns here. I am not extending it to allow incivility...

MS. C. COOPER: Sir...

CHAIRMAN: So if you have a question, ma'am, address the line and come to the microphone.

MS. C. COOPER: But sir, you have the room booked for four hours, why did you determine that the questions should only last for an hour?

CHAIRMAN: We agreed to that before you came here. If you hadn't been late you would have heard.

MS. C. COOPER: I was here before the meeting started...

CHAIRMAN: We have said an hour, we agreed to an hour...

MS. C. COOPER: You said an hour but we didn't agree...

CHAIRMAN: I didn't hear any dissent...

MS. C. COOPER: You unilaterally said it was going to be an hour...

CHAIRMAN: I did not hear any dissent...

MS. C. COOPER: Can't we have late dissent?

CHAIRMAN: I'll tell you what, if I am not allowed to speak and then you speak, we will not have this session. I am extending the period of time. I volunteered that before you protested, so allow it to happen.

Thank you. Sir?

MR. BROWN: Let me just do one thing, the word 'our' should have been this development. I have no personal interest in this.

This development cannot generate an odour problem. There are design parameters and regulations which govern the situations that create that odour and if you put it in the design, it will not happen. It is as simple as that. The problem that you are having now is something to be addressed separate and apart from the development that we are speaking about; same thing from Mona Great House, *et cetera*.

(Soto voce comment)

MR. BROWN: Yes. I know.

CHAIRMAN: Sir.

MR. E. DAWKINS: Earl Dawkins is the name. On the question of the sewage, I don't think the presentation here about sewage is adequate and that is a very important thing in any development, particularly a residential development. Because I am just trying to gather from the verbal presentation what it is, maybe a schematic drawing would set it straight to person's mind, but what I'm understanding is, on the scheme you'll have a pumping station to pump the sewage to Karachi and then probably pump it somewhere else again, right? When in the first presentation it was just a simple connect to the central sewer of NWC. That sounds like somebody on the flat just have a manhole and you flush your toilet and it go by gravity right down to the sewer plant.

For the presentation, you should be more forthright about how the sewage should be treated. I don't think the verbal presentation of that brought it out.

Next question. On the question of the nine per cent (9%)/two hundred (200) acres that will not be occupied, would you recommend that they put that as a caveat in the title to say that - a

personal guarantee to say that those areas or that area in the lot will not be occupied, by virtue of title?

Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Yes, sir, the sewage collection system is like in every other subdivision in Jamaica. Sewage comes out of the house in a lateral and it goes into a sewer main which runs, usually, down the centre of the road.

In this development, all of that sewage is collected in one location, at the foot of the subdivision. It is pumped from there to a manhole in Karachi that gravity flows the sewage to the Karachi Pump Station. From Karachi, it pumps into the general gravity sewer system that takes it to the treatment plant. That's the system that is there right now.

MR. E. DAWKINS: So, the sewage is treated?

CHAIRMAN: Are there questions?

MR. BROWN: No, not treated, it is lifted. What is happening is you have different elevations, different heights.

MR. E. DAWKINS: Just a point of order, because I think – no, you are saying it is going to a treatment plant in Karachi?

MR. BROWN: No, no, a pump station. It just pumps the sewage from a big manhole, so to speak.

MR. E. DAWKINS: You mentioned that there is a pump station on site?

MR. BROWN: Right.

MR. E. DAWKINS: It goes to a manhole in Karachi?

MR. BROWN: Right.

MR. E. DAWKINS: And it's gravity fed to a treatment plant in Karachi...

MR. BROWN: No, no, no treatment plant.

MR. E. DAWKINS: What is it? A pumping station?

MR. BROWN: Separate treatment plant from a pumping station. A pumping station...

MR. E. DAWKINS: Okay, I am trying to get your word clearly.

MR. BROWN: Right, right.

MR. E. DAWKINS: Because we are at the manhole in Karachi, gravity fed to what, in Karachi?

MR. BROWN: It goes to a pumping station further down in Karachi; pumping station.

MR. E. DAWKINS: Okay. So it passes through two pumping stations, one on site...

MR. BROWN: Right.

MR. E. DAWKINS: ...to the manhole...

MR. BROWN: Right.

MR. E. DAWKINS: ...down to another pumping station.

MR. BROWN: Right.

MR. E. DAWKINS: So the only time it's been treated is when it reach down to our central treatment plan.

MR. BROWN: That's correct, that's correct.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR. E. DAWKINS: The next question.

CHAIRMAN: I'm closing off at 6:30 – I mean 7:30.

PARTICIPANT: He has another question... Chairman...

CHAIRMAN: Just a minute.

MR. E. DAWKINS: Yeah, other question about the...

CHAIRMAN: Before the next question, ladies and gentlemen, the consultants have asked to make a statement and I am going to allow it.

MS. BROWN SMITH: We just wanted to – I notice these comments have been made and raised more than once in the meeting, so we just want to declare and make it clear that we are consultants, we have no personal interest in this project. We record what we find on the ground and that is what it is. So what is there is what it is. If what you hear is

not necessarily what you want to hear, we have no control over that.

So we are just declaring that we are professionals and we are declaring that we found what we found.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Yes, ma'am.

MS. WILLIAMS: Can you say for the record, who commissioned and paid for the EIA? Could you say if the report was read by the developer and commented on before publication and can you state categorically that in your recommendation Rutland Drive is not recommended to be opened up as a street to this development?

MS. BROWN SMITH: The whole process involved liaising with the developer, obviously, because they are the project proponent, so obviously, we have to liaise with them. And as far as I'm aware there are no plans to open Rutland Drive.

MS. WILLIAMS: Okay, can I ask the questions again, who pays for the study?

MS. BROWN SMITH: Well, that is how it operates in Jamaica at the moment, the project proponent pays for the study.

MS. WILLIAMS: Was the report read by the developer and commented on, changed before publication?

MS. BROWN SMITH: Obviously the developer has to read the study to find out what the findings are; not changed but obviously if there are errors or any corrections to be made, yes they are made.

MS. WILLIAMS: And can you state categorically that in your recommendation, Rutland Drive or Montclair Close in Beverly Hills were not recommended to be opened up as roads?

MS. BROWN SMITH: I think there is an original design, but that has since been changed.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Next question.

MR. S. DAWKINS: Stephen Dawkins, again, Long Mountain Country Club. For the last two years, the Long Mountain Country Club has been having - what we call - water problems. In other words, NWC, based on their pumping system, cannot supply adequate water to the community. So, from time to time – luckily, we have a tank on the community, so from time to time we have to cut it off and manage the water supply. With this proposed development, what are the plans to improve the water supply system?

Thank you.

MR. BROWN: NWC would have to address that problem. Once they give the commitment for supply that's all we can go on. We can't instruct them what to do but we will have sufficient capacity in storage on site to deal with the...

MS. WILLIAMS: We?

MR. BROWN: The developer.

MS. McCAULAY: Page 58 of the new EIA, *“in a survey among residents conducted in 2010, most residents (90%) interviewed, were satisfied with the potable water supply. See pages 611. None of these residents expressed fear of a threat to the Mona Reservoir and Mona Treatment Plant by the proposed development.”* The point I’m trying to make about the disconnect between what we are saying and what is written in your EIA.

CHAIRMAN: Response?

Any further questions? One last question.

MR. E. DAWKINS: On the caveat for the title for the reserved section, we didn’t hear any answer if that would be a recommendation.

MS. BROWN SMITH: Well the Housing Agency of Jamaica is represented here and I’m sure they are noting your concerns.

MR. S. DAWKINS: (*Soto voce* comment)

CHAIRMAN: Is it a follow up to your water issue? Make sure it’s a follow up.

MR. S. DAWKINS: It’s a follow up, not the water issue...

CHAIRMAN: But it’s another question. You will have to wait until after this gentleman.

MR. MILLER: Maurice Miller, Pines of Karachi. I have two questions. What is the relationship of the consultancy group here to the issues? Are they retained by the Housing Agency?

CHAIRMAN: I think they answered that question.

MR. MILLER: No, I didn't hear the answer. ...and two, in light of the methodology used in the survey that is obviously flawed, will a new survey method be introduced where the weighting is on the communities that are directly impacted by the development?

(Applause)

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Response?

The first part of the question, who retained you?

MS. BROWN SMITH: I'm not sure, I'm trying to figure out what is the situation in Jamaica. What normally happens when an EIA is done? Is it NEPA that pays the consultants?

MR. E. DAWKINS: No, just answer the question.

CHAIRMAN: No, I'm the Chairman, sir.

MR. E. DAWKINS: She asked the question.

CHAIRMAN: She shouldn't have or I should have stopped her.

MS. BROWN SMITH: I'm sorry, I'm sorry. ..because that is the norm, that is what obtains at the moment.

CHAIRMAN: The answer for the record, they are retained by HAJ.

MS. BROWN SMITH: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: And the other question, which is about the methodology of the survey. What is your intention or your response?

MS. BROWN SMITH: I'm not sure what is the point in surveying the residents in the area – in the immediate vicinity, I am not sure. Because I think there was a survey that was once done. I'm not sure. Maybe I can get the result of that survey then. Maybe it could be incorporated into the study.

CHAIRMAN: All right, and if you have a follow up, and after that ladies and gentlemen...

MR. MILLER: I just wanted to clarify my question on the survey methodology, that I'm just suggesting that perhaps the weighting should be stronger on the affected communities, like Pines of Karachi, *et cetera* and not on Mona Heights because of population.

CHAIRMAN: Point is noted.

Yes, sir?

MR. S. DAWKINS: I actually didn't get a response to the road going up, because I don't know if you are aware, but that road has already started to break away, and in fact Long Mountain, when we were told we owned that road, we were setting aside funds to do the necessary repairs. So what I'm saying to you is, that road has some deep erosion under that any minute now it can fail and then the only access will be through Beverly Hills.

MR. BROWN: Well, I have just taken a note of what you said and I will pass that on to my client for consideration.

MS. WILLIAMS: And in response to your comments or questions about the survey that was done, if you recall at the last public meeting I did mention that we did a survey, at least two hundred (200) people were in that survey, granted it was Beverly Hills, but that was our survey, an input into the process. I pointed out that it existed and asked that you take a look at it and I don't think you did because you are back with – how many? Fifty-four (54) people, thirty-one (31) of them from Mona Heights. And for the record, I just want to say I just think that that is not a study that can be relied on. Again, the gentleman said the people who are impacted most should be the people you talk to about this.

And then also, Mr. Chairman, just finally from me, the roads in Beverly Hills are also of concern if the development is allowed to

go through, in terms of the additional traffic. Those roads were not built to accommodate what's there now, let alone additional people coming on it. The roads are winding. You can go and see for yourself what they look like. They are not roads.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Miss Rowe.

Sorry, beg pardon.

MS. BROWN SMITH: Can I be allowed to respond? For the purpose of the survey, we could not treat Beverly Hills as an enclave. We have to treat all the areas impacted or within, as we call it, the receptor areas. So you are suggesting that we should treat Beverly Hills by itself, as an enclave...

MS. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman, may I please correct that. No, I'm just saying that the survey was done, it is available. It was about four times the number of people that you interviewed and we asked at that public meeting that you take that into consideration. That was all we were asking.

MS. BROWN SMITH: Is there any obvious... well, okay fine.

(Laughter)

MS. BROWN SMITH: Obviously, we want to have a survey that is representative of the receptor community, so we do not want a survey that is skewed for any particular demography. That is just one of the challenges we

have. So we have to balance the challenge of having a survey that is skewed and one that is general.

MISS ROWE: Just for clarification, I have a note ...

CHAIRMAN: Can we have some order please so we can hear what she's saying.

MISS ROWE: ...and I think it would be receptor area, but I am asking for clarification. I have a note that says '**3665 persons in 0.7% of the St. Andrew population**' could you tell us what that information is taken from and how the forty people relate to that number?

CHAIRMAN: You understand? She's saying that the presentation referred to 3665 people as being the total pool - and you are asking how the survey sample relates to that? Sample size is what you are talking about?

MS. BROWN SMITH: As I said before that we took an approximate 1.5 kilometre radius from the site and we looked at all the EDs within that radius and we took roughly one per cent or thereabout from each ED and we came up with that total. So each ED was represented equally.

CHAIRMAN: Okay. I am now going to bring this session to an end. I thank you for your patience and most of you for your discipline.

Thank you.

Meeting ends at 7:40 p.m.



Housing Agency of Jamaica Limited

Public Presentation

**Part of Mona, Papine Estates and Goldsmith
Villa, St. Andrew (called Mona Estate, Section 1)**

Wednesday, April 25, 2012

Knutsford Court Hotel
Ruthven Road
Kingston 10
Jamaica, W.I.

Meeting commenced at 5:40 p.m.

CHAIRMAN: Ladies and gentlemen, good evening. Welcome to the Environmental Impact Assessment for the Mona Land Subdivision, Part of Mona and Papine Estates and Goldsmith Villa in St. Andrew.

I am Howard Mitchell. I am your Chairman for this event. I am an attorney at law by profession, retired, and the immediate past chairman of the National Housing Trust.

My only function here this evening is to attempt to conduct these proceedings with order, civility and with impartiality.

To that end, I am proposing that first of all, we operate under what is known as Robert's Rules of Order; the main principles of which are that we conduct ourselves with decency and courtesy to each other.

We have a microphone in the centre of the room. We will entertain one question at a time. We are proposing a limit of three minutes per question. The questions might be segmented, serialized, phased, but they must be asked within the three minute time frame.

There is a court reporter present so I am asking that you speak slowly and clearly so that the proceedings can properly be recorded.

Questions must be relevant, unfortunately in my opinion, to the proceedings and to the issues raised by the presentation and must not be editorial or policy statements.

One follow up clarificatory question will be allowed after each response is given. No repeat questioning by any one person will be allowed until all others have been satisfied. Questions will go by rote.

There must be one meeting. I cannot entertain side meetings; side discussions in the room. If you are going to have them, I have no difficulty if you step outside.

Questioners must state their names and their connection to the issue, prior to putting their question. Any issue surrounding that?

Yes, ma'am.

MS. McCAULAY: My name is Diana McCaulay, I am from the Jamaica Environment Trust. I hear you are...

CHAIRMAN: Sorry, I'm also hard of hearing, sorry.

MS. McCAULAY: Sorry, I've lost my voice. Everybody will be glad to hear.

I just have a question about the actual presentation and the rules governing that. In the past we, not particularly related to this issue, but I am a veteran of such meetings and we have had presentations going on for a very long time. We are leaving a very short time for the public part. So I would like to hear what kind of...

CHAIRMAN: I am told that the presentation will take thirty to forty minutes. I would like to propose that we allow an hour for questioning and discussion. Is that agreeable?

MS. McCAULAY: Yes. Well, to me.

CHAIRMAN: Well, that is a good start.

There is an agenda.

MS. McCAULAY: Is there?

CHAIRMAN: I have one, sorry. If you haven't received one I can read it out for you. The agenda says: welcome and introduction, it also says Chairman's message. I have none. There is a presentation by EPN Consultancy, which we referred earlier, which is estimated, as I said, to take thirty to forty minutes.

I will not entertain questions during the presentation. I would ask that you hold your questions until the presentation is complete. And then there is a question and answer period which we are

proposing for an hour, if there are that many questions, and then hopefully any other business and adjournment.

By nature I seek to be very pleasant by upbringing and very civil. However, I will have no hesitation in suspending or terminating the meeting if any of these rules, including normal rules of courtesy, are breached.

Yes, ma'am.

MS. BEDASSE: Hello, good evening, my name is Aisha Bedasse from NEPA. There is a statement from NEPA that usually precedes the presentation so it should have been included in the agenda.

CHAIRMAN: And that statement will be made in the presentation?

MS. BEDASSE: That statement will be made by myself.

CHAIRMAN: I am finished. If there are any other questions?

MR. E. DAWKINS: Who will the question be directed to, just EPN?

CHAIRMAN: All questions must be directed to the Chairman.

MR. E. DAWKINS: No, but who will be there to answer me?

CHAIRMAN: There are supposed to be consultants here and members of NEPA, members of the Housing Agency of Jamaica. I hope they are aware that the meeting has started. I told them that it had. I know

there are some folks outside. Is there anybody that can call them in for me please?

The requirement that names be stated before the questions are asked is also applicable to those who are answering the questions; names and connection, so that I would ask that members of EPN Consultancy, NEPA, whoever is responding, states their name, their position and their connection.

I am not aware if there is anybody else sitting at the Head Table with me. I don't know if there is anybody from HAJ, but I'm quite happy to be up there by myself.

MS. BEDASSE: Hello, good evening, everyone. As I said before, my name is Aisha Bedasse and I am from the Applications Management Division of the National Environment & Planning Agency. I'm here today to deliver the statement from the agency.

Before I begin, I would like to tender apologies on behalf of Mr. Peter Knight. He is the Chief Executive Officer of the National Environment and Planning Agency and he has been unavoidably detained.

“On 21 July 2009, the site selected for the proposed development was declared under the Housing Act, 1955 by the Honourable Minister of Water and Housing. On 13 October 2009 the National Environment and Planning Agency received an application from the Housing Agency of Jamaica (HAJ) for an Environmental Permit in

the subdivision of 8.4505 hectares into 60 lots comprising of (54 service lots and 6 lots for associated amenities).

An Environmental Statement was submitted in support of the application by the HAJ. The document was reviewed and a decision arrived at that additional information was required. As a consequence NEPA mandated that an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) be conducted for the project. The Terms of Reference (TORs) for the EIA were submitted and reviewed internally and by external stakeholders. The ToRs were approved in letter dated 03 June 2011 and the HAJ was advised to proceed with the preparation of the EIA.

The EIA was submitted to the NEPA on 13 June 2011 and circulated for comments. A public presentation was held on 21 July 2011 at the Courtleigh Hotel at which the proposal was presented to the public, in accordance with the “Guidelines for Conducting Public Presentations” dated 2007-10-25. The comments were received from the general public and these along with those received from external agencies were collated and returned to the HAJL in letter dated 11 October 2011. The HAJL subsequently submitted responses to the comments with cover letter dated 24 November 2011. This document was reviewed and it was noted that a change had been made to the original proposal in that the open space slated for the area known as Mona Section 2 had been relocated to lots 53, 54 and 55.

Subsequent to these changes and the submission of a revised EIA document on 28 March 2012, the HAJL was mandated to convene another Public Meeting in accordance with “The Guidelines for Conducting Public Presentations”.

The revised EIA Report was circulated for comments and is currently being reviewed by the Agency. To date, no additional comments have been received. The Agency is represented at this meeting, to hear your comments, to observe the proceedings in relation to the development and the

additional information provided in the revised EIA.

This public meeting is an integral part of the public consultation that the HAJL is required to conduct by the NEPA. Please bear in mind that no final decision has been made on the application.

We wish to remind you that the process with respect to the public presentation for EIAs is as follows:

- 1. A copy of the Verbatim Minutes of the Public Presentation is submitted to the Agency by the applicant within seven (7) days of the Public Presentation.*
- 2. The public is allowed up to thirty (30) days after the date of the Public Presentation to provide written comments on the proposed development to the Agency.*
- 3. Upon receipt of the comments, they are collated and sent to the applicant for responses to be provided.*
- 4. When the responses are received, a submission is prepared to facilitate the discussions within NEPA. After the internal discussions, the application will be presented with a recommendation to a Technical Review Committee, a sub-committee of the Authority and finally to the Authority. Please note carefully that the Authority takes the final decision.... Not NEPA.*

The revised EIA is available to the public and the document can be accessed at the following locations:

- *NEPA's Documentation Centre*
- *NEPA's website*

<http://www.nepa.gov.jm/eeias/StAndrew/MonaPapineEstate/monapapine.ppdf>

- *Kingston & St. Andrew Parish Library*
- *Kingston and St. Andrew Corporation (KSAC)*

- <http://www.hajl.gov.jm>

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: We can now begin the presentation, sir. Do you want the lights dimmed?

(Lights dimmed for presentation)

CHAIRMAN: Is everybody able to see?

PARTICIPANTS: Yes.

MR. BEAL: Good afternoon everybody. My name is Marlon Beal and I will be making this presentation on...

PARTICIPANT: You are blocking the screen.

(Presenter relocates)

MR. BEAL: As I was saying, I am here to make the presentation on the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) for the proposed subdivision of lands Part of Mona and Papine Estates and Goldsmith Villa, St. Andrew, called Mona Section I.

The Project proponent is as a part of a proposal of the Housing Agency of Jamaica Limited in fulfilling its mandate to be an effective, financially viable and environmentally responsible housing solution facilitator and provider by 2013.

As we can see, the location of the proposed development is highlighted in red and is flanked on the northeastern by Long Mountain Warika Hill,

which is approximately three miles east of Half Way Tree. It is also flanked on the north by Pines of Karachi; the Long Mountain Country Club to the south and upscale Beverly Hills which is located west of the location.

The proposed project - as was earlier indicated, the proposed development or land use is based on zoning requirements wherein which 8.4 hectares - approximately 21 hectares will be used for housing solutions and approximately 81 hectares will remain as conservation for public open space.

We see here that the residential lots occupy 51 service lots which range from 755 square metres to just over 1300 square metres in area. There are open spaces and a retention area which is reserved for eighty per cent (80%) of the site storm water runoff. There is also physical infrastructure based on sewage and drainage easements as well as existing proposed areas for potable water.

There will be on site roads, four of which are reserved and one which is a service lot, and there will also be use of the existing telecom facility.

As we can see, here is a basic layout of the site in which key areas to note are the retention/detention area, an open space, a reserved open space. These are the service lots identified here as well as the existing potable water storage sections.

The project infrastructure comprises: for roads, transportation and traffic, there will be use of the Long Mountain and Karachi Avenue as access points. For potable water there will be use of a sixty thousand (60,000) gallon tank from the National Water Commission; for waste disposal, sewage, there will be use of the National Water Commission central sewage system and for storm water drainage this will be directed to the Mountain View Gully.

As a part of the public participation consultation process there were several activities conducted. We had telephone calls, face-to-face interviews, done both in May of 2010 and March of 2012. There was also a review of the discussion in the public domain. As earlier indicated by Miss Bedasse there was a public presentation of the EIA and there were community surveys conducted.

As a part of the overall process, key definitions needed to be identified: one of which was that of receptor communities and as indicated in the study, the receptor community highlighted in the assessment was an area of 1.5 kilometre radius of the location where the proposed development was to occur.

We see here, basically, identification of the electoral district, the number of households and population based on the 2001 Census which was utilized as a guide throughout the process of doing the public surveys.

Also, as a part of the public consultation and participation, there were questionnaires or questions asked to households within the adjoining communities. And a key question that was asked was, “what would be the main concern in the event of further housing construction and development within the area?”

In 2010 when the survey was conducted, the major concern was that of traffic congestion at forty per cent (40%) and we also noted that thirty per cent (30%) of persons indicated that they had no concerns, where we had ten per cent (10%) indicating environmental pollution and a further ten per cent (10%) indicating overcrowding as a concern.

In 2012 when the survey was redone, utilising the same question it was noted that environmental pollution had a forty-two per cent (42%) response to the concern of further housing construction.

It is important to note for this environmental pollution concern that most residents or most persons who were interviewed, indicated that their concern was in relation to issues of construction such as dust and noise pollution that would occur within the construction phase of the development, but thereafter they expressed that there was no concern further to that.

Again we saw a change in terms of traffic congestion, reducing to six per cent (6%) and overcrowding at four per cent (4%).

PARTICIPANT: How many people were interviewed?

CHAIRMAN: No, no.

PARTICIPANT; Okay, sorry.

CHAIRMAN: For those who came in after the movie started questions will be entertained at the end of the presentation.

PARTICIPANT: Okay.

MR. BEAL: Another question that's a part of the survey was, "what would you as a person recommend for the proposed housing development site?" In 2010 fifty-eight per cent (58%) of the people interviewed indicated that they would agree that a housing solution or housing development could occur at the proposed area. Another thirty-three per cent (33%) indicated that they believed the area should remain as a green space and two per cent (2%) and another five per cent (5%) indicated shops or not sure of what should occur there.

In 2012 forty per cent (40%) of respondents indicated a housing solution was agreeable. A further thirty per cent (30%) indicated not being sure and twenty-one per cent (21%) indicated that the area should remain a green area.

As a part of the survey the baseline environment was surveyed. This included physical, biological - human and social, natural hazards and heritage.

With respect to the physical, we see here, this being the Mona Dam, this is in lighter green here, the proposed development Mona Section I. We see here also currently occurring in the Long Mountain solution as well as natural storm water drainage at the foot of the Long Mountain opposite the National Water Commission property.

In terms of the geologic formation, we see that the site is underlain by two formations of white limestone groupings, the first of which is dominant, being the Newport White Limestone which shows a variation formed from massive rocks to a more honeycomb type structure.

Continuing on the physical, it is noted that approximately eighty per cent (80%) of the land mass exists on slopes which dip towards the west. So, it is basically indicating that the slope is on this side, not towards the Mona Reservoir itself.

There is an average slope gradient of fourteen degrees or twenty-five per cent (25%) and the elevation of the site ranges from 200 to 260 metres above sea level.

With respect to soil, the site is also underlain by Bonnygate Stony Loam and this is deposited as surficial material atop the limestone bedrock.

The soil generally is between two point five four (2.54) to thirty point four eight (30.48) centimetres and has a high erosion capacity, but also experiences rapid internal drainage due to the porosity of the limestone.

With respect to hydrology the project site falls within the Hope River Watershed Management Unit and for surface drainage, there is no perennial surface drainage system due to the intrinsic high permeability of the limestone formation which is beneath. There is also artificial drainage features along the access roads to the Long Mountain Country Club, which includes kerb and gutter as well as grided inlets across the main road.

Here, the diagram clearly indicates, with the proposed site being located here, this is the Mona Reservoir on your right, shows the flow of water from the property in the watershed area, indicating that the flow of water is not towards the dam itself but towards the west, as indicated, down towards the Mountain View Gully.

Here again - first of all, I would like to indicate the drainage flow, and basically we see here, from the property, the natural storm water runoff which comes down towards Long Mountain, towards Pines of Karachi, utilizing the existing drains; these drains then adjoin into the Mountain View Gully and then further continues into the Mountain View Gully. It is also important to highlight here, based on elevational change that the highest point of the ridge is within the property itself, towards the west.

Here, as earlier indicated, the artificial and natural water runoff that will occur. Here we see a spillway. This is an example of a grided inlet which occurs along the access road, and here we see the natural runoff that

allows the storm water to drain at the foot of Long Mountain, redirecting it towards the Mountain View Gully.

It is important also to note that there is a berm – well in the natural area, there is a berm which naturally prevents the water from running on to the National Water Commission facilities.

With respect to ground water, the dominant perennial drainage, as earlier said, is on the ground. The two limestone formations which occur are the Gibraltar-Bonnygate and Newport Limestone formations. There is significant underground water storage and movement under normal hydrologic conditions and the depth of the ground water is one hundred and three metres (103m) below ground level, as indicated by the nearest well at Beverly Hills.

With respect to natural hazards – the main natural and hydrological hazards which were considered were earthquakes, hurricanes, slope failure, soil erosion, land subsiding and flooding.

With respect to slope failure, the Newport and Rubbly Walderston Limestones are very stable. With respect to erosion, we see that the chalky and nodular forms of the Gibraltar-Bonnygate formation does make it susceptible to erosion by water.

With respect to earthquakes, in January of 1993, there was noted damage to the National Water Commission filter plant, there were ground cracks along the embankment roads on the south western section of the Mona

Reservoir and this triggered rockslides into the limestone corridor located near the reservoir itself.

With respect to flooding – flood susceptibility of the proposed site is very low and this has been confirmed by a July 2011 report done by the ODPEM.

Moving on to the biological – we see that the vegetation is considered degraded dry limestone forest and is clearly exposed to previous levels of degradation. The site is covered by dry land from secondary growth with few emergent trees. It is noted also that the overall tree diversity is low. And the habitat type is woodland or scrub with coppiced trees and the emergent trees are, for example, Red Birch or *Bursera Simaruba* and other common trees include *Acacia Tortuosa*.

Here is a vegetation map indicating that where the proposed site is to be, is degraded forest with a small area of scrub located at the top.

With respect to fauna, a total of twenty-eight bird species were identified and this included eleven (11) endemic species. Eight (8) of these species observed were Jamaican endemic subspecies. The species composition was noted not to be unique to the proposed site and the bird species was noted to be low due to the relatively poor condition of the vegetation. It is noted also that there were no threatened neo-tropical migratory species that winter in the Caribbean known to occur in the proposed development area.

With respect to the heritage – The Jamaica National Heritage Trust in 2010 did a survey and the report indicated that the archeological features and artifact appendages observed near the site were not considered significant to warrant a declaration for preservation.

Moving on to the human and social – with respect to population it was noted that the receptor community was approximately three thousand six hundred and fifty-five (55) persons, based on the 2001 Population Census or represented zero point seven per cent (0.7%) of the over population of St. Andrew.

With respect to social services and amenities, infrastructure - with respect to the housing demand it is noted that there are over twenty-two thousand (22,000) students enrolled between the University of the West Indies and the University of Technology and therefore, because of these educational institutions in the area, there is a unique challenge in terms of housing demand and accommodation.

With respect to traffic, a complete build-out within five (5) years, indicated at approximately fifty-two (52) vehicles during afternoon peak hours would result in less than one (1) vehicle per minute occurring on the road.

And with respect to landscape and visual impact assessment, the small size of the subdivision indicates that the scale of the impact in general is minimal.

The loss of natural vegetation is east of the main road and the visual impact would be to residents in close proximity to the site.

Identification and assessment of direct and indirect impact and mitigation measures – the effect of flooding, the impact and mitigation – storm water flows on the site from Long Mountain Country Club, an adjacent property, could impact the site negatively. The mitigative measures to be undertaken for on-site flooding will be through proposed engineering solutions that have incorporated LEED principles where appropriate. LEED is leadership in energy and environmental design.

With respect to storm water – sorry, offsite storm water from Rutland Drive in Beverly Hills could flow on to the site, but the runoff would be directed to the proposed retention pond; also two spillways that direct flow on to the property will be blocked and an inlet manhole installed with grill cover in the kerb, to alleviate this water.

Here again, indication of the natural runoff of storm water at the foot of Long Mountain, away from national Water Commission facilities.

With respect to the drainage, as earlier stated, the natural depression on the site will be used to deposit eighty per cent (80%) of the storm water generated from the catchment area. The excess water from the retention pond will be contained by a one thousand five hundred millimetre (1500mm) wide and twelve hundred millimetre (1200mm) deep drain

across the main road to an existing drain in the Pines of Karachi to the west of the Mona Reservoir.

This depression will also be a point of infiltration that will effectively recharge the local aquifer.

With respect to land use, the scale of the proposal as indicated before, is eight point four (8.4) hectares and this is guided in terms of land use by the 1966 Kingston & St. Andrew Development Order, based on zoning.

Residual impact –the residual impact assessment with respect to the existing drainage assumes that there will be no direct or indirect impact on existing drainage, except that every possible mitigation measure will be employed to minimize any risk through the design of new drainage structure or the improvement of existing ones.

For the human and social, it is noted that one local residual impact is the increase in traffic flow which, though insignificant on the existing road network the use of Long Mountain and Karachi Roads will reduce any residual impact on the Beverly Hills roadways.

Moving on to cumulative impact – it is noted that one potential cumulative impact of the proposal is the reduction in recharge amounts resulting from the proposed as well as prior development that will impact the long term yield of the production wells that tap the local aquifer.

With respect to monitoring and management, we have tabled here a list of indicators, the target as well as the agency or individual which is responsible. So, as a simple example with respect to solid waste as an indicator, there will be proper and timely disposal of all solid waste including construction waste from the site itself and this would be the responsibility of the NSWMA as well as the developer itself.

In summary, the proposed project lies within the mandate of the HAJ Limited. It is noted that the development will only use nine per cent (9%) of the current land for fifty-one (51) residential lots and the rest will remain as a green area.

A consultative process has been employed. The survey indicated that the percentage of persons who preferred or recommended housing for the area was fifty-eight per cent (58%) in 2010 and this decreased to forty per cent (40%) in 2012.

All five (5) aspects of the environment have been assessed with impact considered and mitigative measures recommended. Residual and cumulative impact have been accounted for, along with suggested monitoring and management framework within the EIA itself.

It is important to note that due diligence has been done throughout this process, as the facts indicate that the project proposal has received approval or no objection letters from the National Environmental Planning Agency, primary partners, and these have been listed below, such as

National Water Commission, the Mines and Geology Division, the ODPEM as well as the Water Resources Authority.

I thank you for listening.

(Applause)

CHAIRMAN: Ladies and gentlemen, for the benefit of those who came in late or those with short memories like myself, let me just reiterate, we will entertain questions one at a time. Questions should be posed at the microphone, questions must be posed to the Chairman. Questions must not take longer than three minutes; they can be serialized, segmented, complicated, simple, but they mustn't take longer than three minutes. One follow up question will be allowed after the response and the response will be given by one of the consultants or the appropriate person who can answer the question.

There is a court reporter. I am therefore asking that you speak slowly and clearly. The purpose of this session is to capture your concerns, your complaints, your criticisms. It is not necessarily to allow editorializing on general issues.

No repeat questioning by any one person will be allowed, until all others have been satisfied and questions will go by rote. I am asking that we maintain proper rules of order and be civil to each other.

You may approach the microphone - stand to be recognized, approach the microphone. The person at the microphone poses their question, the next person standing that I recognize will be allowed to ask their question. You are to state your name and your connection before you have asked your question. All questions must come through the Chairman.

Thank you. I recognize this lady

MS. C. COOPER: I'm Carolyn Cooper and my interest is as a resident of the adjacent area. I want to raise a question about the claim in the second to last slide or the last slide, that the National Water Commission has given its approval for the project. I quote from Page 18 of the report where some of the clear concerns are identified,

“With respect to HAJ proposal discussions have included:

1. The Long Mountain is the watershed area for the Mona Dam....”

CHAIRMAN: Can you slow down for me?

MS. COOPER: Well, I'm trying to ask my question within the three minutes which I am allowed.

CHAIRMAN: It's all right. I will allow some latitude on that question.

MS. COOPER: Thank you.

“..The Long Mountain is the watershed area for the Mona Dam,

Discharge of additional storm water into the drainage channel could erode the lower slopes facing the reservoir

Sewage from the proposed development entering the Mona Reservoir

The need to assess the potential impact of the proposal with respect to the reservoir and the potable water supply, wild life and solid waste.

The above assertions have now been corroborated by the NWC, see NWC Approval letter in Appendix 16.3.”

However, when you turn to the Appendix, it is clear that the National Water Commission has given no approval. The letter that is there attached, I don't know if anybody who wrote the assessment read the letter, but the letter under the signature of Franklyn T. Williams, Chief Engineer, Senior Vice President of the National Water Commission, dated October 22, 2009 and headed “without prejudice” states:

“Notwithstanding the foregoing, it must be understood that this letter does not constitute an NWC approval. Such approval must be endorsed by the President and the Chairman.

With regard to your request to the NWC to provide its comments with regard to the proposed project in relation to the Mona Reservoir the Commission, at this time, would be concerned with the matter of storm water runoff as it relates to possible flooding of our existing Mona Water Treatment Plant.”

So my question to you, Chair, is how do the writers of this assessment explain the disparity between their claim that the National Water Commission has approved the project and the

Water Commission's own statement that it has not approved the project and in fact has concerns for water runoff.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Response? HAJ?

MRS. SMITH BROWN: There is a letter here in the report dated February 16, 2012 that says,

“Having received the sewage and water layout drainage design for the for the proposed HAJ subdivision at Mona Section I, the National Water Commission offers no objection to approval for the development. We further add that the Mona Reservoir Treatment Plant will not be affected by the development.”

CHAIRMAN: One clarificatory question.

MS. COOPER: Could you clarify the basis on which the Water Commission has changed its mind? What is the evidence on which the document that you supplied is now being seen as relevant and you read another letter that is not in the document for us to review.

MS. BROWN SMITH: The letter is actually in the document; the revised version.

MS. COOPER: On what page?

MS. SMITH BOWN: Page 113.

MS. COOPER: So why did you refer to the document I read, if there is another one that supports your claim?

CHAIRMAN: Can I just make a point? That is a valid question and if there is a procedural reference or procedural correction that you need to make, it should be made now. And all the participants here this evening refer to that particular letter if they have not seen it already.

MS. BROWN SMITH: I'm not sure exactly what response I am to make here, but be that as it may, NWC - I don't think there is anyone represented here but we can only refer to the last communication with them with respect to the development.

CHAIRMAN: What you are saying is that their letter was in fact recorded and is on the record, subsequent to the letter referred to?

MS. BROWN SMITH: (Nods).

CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you. Next.

MS. COOPER: But is it in the document? Is it available for us to look at?

MS. BROWN SMITH: Yes, it is in the EIA.

MS. COOPER: On what page?

CHAIRMAN: She did say the page.

MS. COOPER: It is not on page 113.

PARTICIPANT Page 130; Page 130.

CHAIRMAN: I will bring an end to that particular issue.

Go ahead.

MS. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, Jennifer Rowe, I am a resident on the Karachi side. Assuming that the project is going ahead as planned, not necessarily supporting that, but assuming that, I notice traffic being sent through the Karachi side. At present, and I am not sure if any recognition has been taken of it, the Mona Road is almost impassable when rain falls. I am not talking about flood or hurricane, I am talking about rain. Even getting into Karachi is a major problem.

What is being taken into account of Mona Road with clearing of traffic and any emergency evacuation, should it be necessary?

CHAIRMAN: Response? Is there anybody to respond to that?

MS. BROWN SMITH: We are not aware of any measures being taken. I think the focus was on the actual development area.

CHAIRMAN: Miss Rowe, do you have a clarificatory question?

MISS ROWE: I would just ask that it be noted.

MS. McCAULAY: Mr. Chairman, I have a quick question. Would you please introduce the people at the Head Table.

CHAIRMAN: I can't.

MS. McCAULAY: You can't? Well, can they introduce themselves?

CHAIRMAN: Valid point. When you are responding give your name and your connection as I had said earlier.

MS. McCAULAY: You think it will come?

CHAIRMAN: I think it is appropriate.

PARTICIPANT: It is important to know what...

CHAIRMAN: Hold on, hold on, calm down. Could you repeat what you were saying, sir?

PARTICIPANT: No, I was saying they could introduce themselves, because we can pose some questions depending on the particular person.

CHAIRMAN: All right, fine. Introduce yourselves, please.

MS. BROWN SMITH: Beverline Brown Smith, EPN Consultant Limited.

MR. BROWN: Barry Brown, Consulting Engineer to EPN Consultants.

MR. BEAL: Marlon Beal, Consultant, working with EPN.

MS. McCAULAY: Thank you.

My comment really is for the National Environment & Planning Agency. I think the presentation did not reflect what is actually written in the EIA. Because of the timeframe I am going to give you two examples. For instance Mr. Beal mentioned the zoning

issue without stating that the plan being proposed for development is designated as a conservation area green space according to Town and Country Planning Authority, Kingston Development Order 1966...” he actually goes on to make a case that “***while general zoning has been established for Long Mountain, there are other land uses which do not comply***” and it makes the case that because there have been other breaches, further breaches should continue. But Mr. Beal’s presentation did not go into any of that. So anyone who is sitting in this room thinking that that presentation is accurately reflecting what is actually written in the document is mistaken and I do not think NEPA should allow that.

The second example I am going to give, and I could give many but you are going to constrain me, is on the question of seismic instability. Mr. Beal moved quickly over that. However, in the EIA it says,

“This development will be located 500 metres from an active fault zone and will be girded by two more fault structures. The area is prone to potentially dangerous and damaging seismic events...”

That’s Page 26,

Local rock formations exhibit numerous fractures and brecciation, according to the computation of the geologist, for these fault structures.

Earthquake sources in the Blue Mountain region are only 8 kilometre radius from the project site. This coupled with the presence of faults and fracture zones in the project area make the general

area susceptible to experiencing the effects of moderate to severe earthquake events.

Earthquakes and other manmade disturbances from construction may result in differential settlement and collapse of large cavities.”

So the EIA itself actually outlines quite serious scientific events not represented in that presentation. There are very many issues with the EIA that I do not think I am going to be able to stand up here and raise.

I would say I was very disappointed to see the lack of improvement over the first effort and I guess the last thing I would - we will send all these in writing, but I do not think NEPA should allow that glossing over of the issues that are stated and unstated in the EIA.

A degraded forest, ladies and gentlemen, can be restored, can come back over time. Once it is covered with houses, there is no going back.

(Applause)

And that is what really we are being told that ‘oh, it is kinda mashed up, we dun mek some bad mistakes in the past, but we should continue on that road.’

I also want to know finally, what is the position of the National Environment & Planning Agency, now under the Ministry of Land

Water Environment and Climate Change, about the taking out of the large areas of, even admittedly, degraded forest.

(Applause)

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Do we have a response from the consultants?

MS. BROWN SMITH: The question was directed to NEPA.

CHAIRMAN: Is there a representative from NEPA here who could respond to that? Let it be noted that the question is not responded to by NEPA. We don't know if they are present or not but they are not responding to us.

MR. HENRY: NEPA is not present to answer any questions.

CHAIRMAN: Pardon me?

MR. HENRY: The representative from NEPA clearly stated that we are not here to answer questions...

CHAIRMAN: Can you approach the mike for me so that we can get it in the record. Sorry. Go ahead. Name?

MR. HENRY: Ainsley Henry, Director of Applications Management at NEPA. As the representative earlier stated, we are not here to answer questions today, we are here to listen to the comments, to the

concerns being raised and to make a note of them, not to respond to them.

CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you. Yes, ma'am?

MS. KING: My name is Sonia King, a Beverly Hills resident. I was absolutely amazed that none of your respondents showed any concerns about the water source being contaminated from all the environmental problems. Water was not one of the issues that came up and in my community that is one of our major issues.

On the map that you kept showing, you said that the runoff from the development would be going away from the dam, but then you spoke about natural hazards and earthquakes and hurricanes. We know what can happen there and I mean a backflow into the dam would seriously affect our water source. That is just a point. I am just wondering where did you take your questionnaire? Because certainly it wasn't in my area, because nobody expressed a concern about a major thing; water is life. I don't understand. I am just confused, so I'm just putting that out there. All right.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

A response to that? Presumably the basis of your survey, the structure of the survey.

MR. BROWN: Barry Brown. There really should be no concern about water getting over into the dam. The dam structure is higher than the surrounding property. There is also an additional berm that is built to protect all NWC's facilities. Even if the berm is damaged, the water cannot reach inside the dam. It is as simple as that.

CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MS. P. COOPER SHAND: I'm Pearline Cooper Shand from the Pines of Karachi and based on the responses you got from your survey, no one from the Pines of Karachi was a part of your sample. No one could have given you any positive answer.

But first I want to establish that the Pines of Karachi is not averse to any housing solution. We are not. But at this time we are reeling from the impact of a nearby housing development. And I see here in an October 11 letter from Mr. Shoucair where he acknowledges all the problems that we have at the Pines of Karachi. Some of them are oblivious even to the development from which they occurred.

From a Powerpoint presentation, I saw where the sewage was going to be joined to us. I see where a developer said that it would create a stink. But as I said to NEPA, no other stink can be created than what we experience at this time, on a daily basis at the Pines of Karachi.

I also see where the Pines of Karachi will be the major corridor. I am saying that that has been maintained by us over the past decade and it is only because of this development that Mr. Shoucair has said that the Housing Agency owns the roads.

We fix the roads, we buy our street lights, we buy our street signs and the only way he can claim that road now is if he pays us retroactively for all that we have done to that road. It is just now that he is claiming and over a decade that road has been maintained by us.

In terms of traffic, where you say one per minute; one per minute! We cannot even walk on that road, morning and evening, not only due to the number of motor vehicles, but to the speed. We cannot walk on that road at all. We don't send our children even to next door, for fear of losing them.

So, again, I was told that the sewage would be joined to the Pines of Karachi. Right now, it is not only the sewage that we are having a problem with from Long Mountain, but from the Mona Great House where we are experiencing not only stench, but raw sewage in our major canal. We can take no other burden, no other burden.

Traffic - there was an idea to put the traffic down to the netball field, we would appreciate if that could be in the system. Because based on what I have heard now, everything is positive about this

development, therefore we are to now think of how it is going to impact us...

CHAIRMAN: Twenty seconds warning.

MS. P. COOPER SHAND: Twenty seconds left?

CHAIRMAN: Twenty seconds.

MS. P. COOPER SHAND: Well, I will come back at the end of everybody else because I have a mammoth thing to say. All I want to end by saying is that we are not against housing solutions but right now we are reeking with the effects of nearby developments. Sewage, storm drains, roads, you name it, and that's the Pines. We seem to be the receptacle for waste.

(Applause)

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Do you want to make a response to that?

I have allowed you a certain amount of latitude in the statements because clearly we cannot restrict ourselves to naked questions. There must be some context, but again I say we don't want this to degenerate into statements of broad policy. We can allow for complaints, concerns, but what we are trying to do is to register the feeling of the public concern to this development. That is the context within which I am trying to operate.

Do you have a response to that series of concerns that was raised?

MS. BROWN SMITH: I think they were raised at the last public presentation and that was left for the Housing Agency of Jamaica to address.

CHAIRMAN: Is everybody hearing?

PARTICIPANT: No, we are not hearing.

CHAIRMAN: That microphone is working.

MS. BROWN SMITH: What I was saying is that those concerns were raised at the last public presentation and Housing Agency made an observation, I think, "will be addressing those concerns."

CHAIRMAN: One clarificatory comment or question, one.

MS. COOPER SHAND: Mr. Shoucair, "we must take responsibility for these issues." But why I am repeating them, madam, is that based on what was reported by this gentleman, it is gone.

MR. BROWN: May I?

(Cross talk)

CHAIRMAN: Can we have one meeting, please.

MR. BROWN: I don't think that decision has been made and nobody said that decision has been made. What I would strongly recommend is

your particular set of problems you are having, please put them in writing.

MS. P. COOPER SHAND: We have an encyclopedia of that.

MR. BROWN: Let them have it at the Agency.

MS. P. COOPER SHAND: Again?

MR. BROWN: Yes, again.

CHAIRMAN: All right. No, no, I will not allow a general argument. The point is, you are putting them in writing, he says do it again. I am not sure of the reasonableness of that but the fact is that it is recorded that you have said that you have put it in writing.

MS. P. COOPER SHAND: Several times.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, ma'am.

MS. MORRISON: I'm Shan Morrison and I'm a Beverly Hills resident. My concerns are two: first of all is this just a plain subdivision or is there a developer that is going to do the development?

CHAIRMAN: That's the whole question?

MS. MORRISON: No.

CHAIRMAN: That one is noted, you will get a response. Go on.

MS. MORRISON: The other thing is, who is going to undertake these mitigation measures that sound so good in the presentation here? Who is going to undertake the mitigation and the drainage measures? That is what I would like to know because right now as the lady says they are being subjected to this nastiness of sewage and the rest of it and nobody seems to do anything about it, no matter how much they complain and no matter how long it is that they are complaining, and you just complain and complain and you stay with your complaints I suppose, until you can't complain any more.

(Applause)

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

The question, for your recollection is, who is the developer, who is going to be responsible for the development and also who is responsible for the mitigation measures?

MS. BROWN SMITH: The proposal is for service lots, so the development will be gradual based on who proceeds with their development.

MS. MORRISON: You mean who buys in?

MS. BROWN SMITH: Exactly.

CHAIRMAN: And the responsibility for mitigation – you had a chart with a list of names of people that would be responsible.

MS. BROWN SMITH: Besides the chart, there is also – if a permit is granted NEPA would include conditions which NEPA, I am sure, would monitor to ensure that those are upheld.

CHAIRMAN: Okay. Sir?

MR. E. DAWKINS: Good evening. My name is Earl Dawkins, just public interest. Two questions: the lots will be sold as lots and concerning the sewer, you said it is attached to the central sewer. Does this mean that it ends up downtown? Where is it actually treated?

MR. BROWN: It will go to the treatment system that now exists for the line going down Hope Road. The sewage from this site will end up at the pumping station at Karachi and all of the sewage that is collected in that area will be pumped to the general NWC sewage system. So it will not be treated anywhere in the area.

MR. E. DAWKINS: You are saying that there is a treatment facility in Karachi?

MR. BROWN: No.

CHAIRMAN: May I remind you that questions must be put through the Chair. If you have a clarificatory question you can go ahead and ask it, but it must be through me.

MR. E. DAWKINS: Yes, man, that's through you; him answer it before him mek you hear it.

So the question... well, go ahead.

MR. BROWN: At present all the sewage that's collected by NWC...

MR. E. DAWKINS: No, from the scheme.

MR. BROWN: No. ... in the general area of Karachi, Liguanea, *et cetera*, goes to a central sewage treatment area. This project will add to that system. The sewage will be collected and sent to the pumping station that now exist at Karachi and it will just pump it, as all the other sewage collected there, to the treatment system.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS. WILLIAMS: Good evening, my name is Fayval Williams, my connection here is that I am a Beverly Hills resident.

At the last public meeting that was held, I raised the question or the issue about the number of people who were interviewed in terms of the charts that were put up, and at the time the number was something like forty people or thereabout, were interview. Given that you have updated this study, can you say how many were there additional people who were interviewed and where do those people live?

CHAIRMAN: Can you speak to the metrics of the study?

MS. BROWN SMITH: If you noticed from the presentation this came from Mona Heights...

CHAIRMAN: Can we have one meeting, please.

MS. BROWN SMITH: I'm sorry, Blue Castle Drive, Wellington Drive, Beverly Hills, Pines of Karachi, Hope Dale Avenue, Glenview. Those are the EDs, the communities within those EDs: 35, 36, 38 39, 46, 47...

CHAIRMAN: It is necessary for all of us to hear... just a minute... if there is a dispute with the response, hold the dispute and frame it in the form of a question.

Go ahead.

MS. WILLIAMS: I'm sorry, I did not hear the number of people she said.

MS. BROWN SMITH: The number of persons, fifty-four (54)

(Laughter)

MS. WILLIAMS: Well, do you think it is appropriate to include people from as far away as Mona Heights in the survey and use that as the basis for saying forty per cent (40%) or fifty per cent (50%) of the people agree to housing on that site?

MS. BROWN SMITH: Because we are using a radius of one point five kilometres (1.5km), we are talking about the receptor communities, we had to include everybody.

MS. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman, may I ask another question? In the summary part of your report, there is a statement that is made that the developer is saying that they will only develop nine per cent (9%) of some over two hundred (200) acres of land that is there and it says the

remaining ninety-one per cent (91%) would remain conservation and public open space.

On what authority do you put that in the report and is it there to make it seem as if there is a nice trade off here to be done?

MS. BROWN SMITH: Well, I'm basically relating what the developer indicated.

CHAIRMAN: In other words, it is a commitment by the developers.

PARTICIPANTS: Can't hear, use the mike.

MS. BROWN SMITH: I was saying that this is information conveyed to us by the developer. They own the property, so they indicated that they will be developing that portion and maintain the rest as green space.

MS. WILLIAMS: So it's just the developer's word?

PARTICIPANT: Who is the developer?

CHAIRMAN: No, no, sorry, you have to wait.

MS. WILLIAMS: Could you state the name of the developer?

MS. BROWN SMITH: The developer is the Housing Agency of Jamaica.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Next – sorry. You first and then this lady.

MS. ANDRADE: Daniel Andrade, Jamaica Environment Trust. I just wanted to follow on, on what Fayval said with a clarification. I read the EIA and it was fifty-two (52) people who were surveyed; thirty-one

(31) of the fifty-two (52) people were from the Mona Heights region.

(Laughter)

I just thought the people, since it was raised, should be mentioned.

I have an issue about – a concern about the storm water runoff and possible contamination of the underground aquifer. I would love to hear from you, what are your plans to deal with pollution, not just sediment control, nutrients now, which natural filtration will not stop. I want to hear more about that.

The other thing I wanted to talk about, you said in the presentation that '*there is no known migratory birds that winter in the area.*'

MR. BEAL: I said there were no '*...threatened...*'

MS. ANDRADE: No threatened migratory birds. I have a concern that you only did a survey over two days in the summer...

MR. BEAL: No.

MS. ANDRADE: ...is it?

MR. BEAL: No.

CHAIRMAN: So, it's three questions, is it? One relating to the adequacy of the survey...

MS. ANDRADE: The adequacy of the survey and also...

CHAIRMAN: The drainage...

MS. ANDRADE: What are the detailed design plans to prevent water contamination from the storm water runoff, and then the third question I had was in relation to your assessment of the migratory birds in that area.

CHAIRMAN: Can I have a response to those three issues.

MS. BROWN SMITH: Well, the survey segment was taken equally from each ED. So if it means that the weight was away from Beverly Hills, it simply means that most of the population is away from Beverly Hills; most of the population in the sample. So it was as simple as that.

CHAIRMAN: You are going to have to try and speak up for me.

MS. BROWN SMITH: It just has to do with the distribution of the population in the area. It had nothing to do with the survey. It's just what the population is. The population came from the survey segment, the survey sample came from the distribution of the population in the area, based on the 2001 Census.

CHAIRMAN: We cannot allow the cross talk.

MS. BROWN SMITH: Yes, Long Mountain of course was included. Everyone living in the area was included.

CHAIRMAN: All right, there are two other segments to the question.

MR. BEAL: With respect to the neo-tropical migratory species, as stated in the presentation, it's the threatened migratory species. The report indicated that there are several neo-tropical migratory species that utilise the area.

With respect to the timeline for the survey, I agree that the initial survey was done across two days. Also taken into consideration was historical data, through surveys conducted by other groups such as Birdlife Jamaica, other university students that have done past surveys within the area itself. Those were considered in respect to determining whether or not threatened neo-tropical migratory species utilized the habitat itself.

CHAIRMAN: You first, then you, ma'am.

PARTICIPANT: There was a third part to the question.

CHAIRMAN: Pardon me?

PARTICIPANT: There was a third part to the question.

CHAIRMAN: What was the third part?

PARTICIPANT: Water quality.

CHAIRMAN: Oh, yes, sorry. There was a third part to the question relating to the ground water pollution, I think. Is there a response?

MR. BROWN: To my mind, the nutrients from runoff would be similar to all the areas that are there. The only difference is that we are having an infiltration basin, which would be different from anywhere else in the area, for eighty per cent (80%) of the flow plus flows from offsite. The other twenty per cent (20%) would be running rapidly down the gully into the formal drainage system.

I don't see how we can remove nutrients from storm water at this point. I don't see how we can do that.

MS. ANDRADE: There are other pollutants.

MR. BROWN: There are no other pollutants apart from rubber...

CHAIRMAN: If you have a question, approach the microphone – a follow up question is allowed - so that we can record it properly and not just have crosstalk which is not captured on the record. If you have a follow up question, let's hear it.

MS. McCAULAY: Mr. Chairman, I want to pose a question.

CHAIRMAN: Not yet.

MS. McCAULAY: When?

CHAIRMAN: You can pose it through her. You can't pose it, you have asked. You will have to wait until everybody else...

MS. McCAULAY: I don't think it is appropriate, right...

CHAIRMAN: I can't hear you.

MS. McCAULAY: We have a question about birds, a question was asked about birds. Mr. Beal has answered the question, but I think his answer is inadequate right and I...

CHAIRMAN: It could, it could, but hold on, this is not a judgement you know, it's a hearing. So it will be recorded.

MS. McCAULAY: Okay. Let me just...

CHAIRMAN: Just let me finish.

MS. McCAULAY: Let me just say what I'm saying and then you can finish.

CHAIRMAN: No, let me just respond to that.

MS. McCAULAY: I'm dealing with the bird thing...

CHAIRMAN: Diana, I hear what you are saying, the question was fulsome, the answer may have been inadequate. But it is not for us here - unless you have a follow up question to draw out more adequacies, I will not entertain a debate on the adequacy of the question, because it is recorded and it will be obvious to see.

MS. McCAULAY: But you are not hearing what I am saying.

CHAIRMAN: That's correct because you are not at the mike.

MS. McCAULAY: Will that solve the problem? What I am trying to say, sir, is that these are sort of issue related stuff. We are dealing with birds, right, we have a question from Daniel. Marlon has answered it and I feel we should wrap up the bird issue before we move on now to the storm water and the drain.

CHAIRMAN: But you thrash it out by her asking a follow up question.

MS. McCAULAY: It's not her follow up question now, it's mine.

CHAIRMAN: No, but it can't be yours because you asked your question already.

MS. McCAULAY: So I have to wait for everybody and then start back on the birds. That's all I'm saying.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, you will have to do that, because that is the only way that I can ensure....

MS. McCAULAY: I think that's a bad process so I want that on the record also.

CHAIRMAN: It's the only way that I can ensure some democracy because there are some other concerns here other than birds.

Yes, ma'am

MS. WEST: Mr. Chairman, my name is Elaine West, I am from Pines of Karachi. I know that National Housing Development, they are the developers. But it was also stated that individual service lots would be built by individuals. How sensible is that in terms of a

development? I can't see the logic in it, because people will do what they want to do and it does not necessarily follow that there will be any kind of monitoring by the various agencies.

We have seen that happening in Karachi and other places and I don't think - it's my opinion that this might not be a good situation. They are not going to develop the housing. They are going to give people to do as they want to do and it might not follow the rules and regulations that are to be followed.

The other part of the question is that the gentleman over there says that a sewage development plant will be lodged in Karachi, it's not there. You know that is very bizarre. Have they or are they supposed to check with the citizens of that development to ensure that they approve or agree that a sewage development plant should be lodged in that part of the community.

We also have a dissipating tank from Long Mountain placed in Karachi. We were not told that that was going to be there. And so they can't keep dumping things on a part of the citizenry and we have no voice.

Where do we go from here? After this meeting, what happens to all the information that flows from this meeting? Will the housing developer be able to continue or are they going to just make a decision and go ahead and sell and get people to develop? I don't

think it is safe and I don't think the citizenry agrees with what is happening.

PARTICIPANT: Mr. Chairman...

CHAIRMAN: Just a minute.

PARTICIPANT: ...can I say something about that....

CHAIRMAN: Well, what I wanted to do is capture the essence of what the lady has said as it relates, and correct me if I am wrong, to the enforceability of these particular provisions against people who buy lots. That's one. Two: there is an issue, as I recall you were saying regarding the sewage disposal or the sewage treatment that was not consented to, right. And there was a third segment, I think she expressed a concern about the general development of the area without the people expressing their consent.

MS. P. COOPER SHAND: Yes, sir, may I be privileged to...in a document written by Robert Cartade, developer of Long Mountain, he said, "*it would be difficult to interrupt the sewage system without causing a literal stink at the Pines of Karachi.*" The same thing that they have said they are going to add their thing to. I just want to underscore...

CHAIRMAN: You are emphasizing the concern relating to the disposal of sewage?

MS. P. COOPER SHAND: Yes. And he said, “*from there, it is gravity fed from Pines of Karachi and it cannot be interrupted.*” This is in here. I have the Gleaner.

CHAIRMAN: Before that lady asks her question, is there a response from the consultants?

MR. BROWN: I don’t think there is any intention of interrupting the gravity flow from the...

(Cross talk)

CHAIRMAN: Allow him to respond.

MR. BROWN: Any concerns like that from the developer, is something that can be addressed.

PARTICIPANT: You should address now.

CHAIRMAN: Allow him to finish.

MR. BROWN: No, no; that can be addressed. The additional amount of sewage coming from the development into your system should not cause a stink. You are not keeping sewage...

PARTICIPANT: That is not the point.

MR. BROWN: It is the point.

CHAIRMAN: I am going to ask that you do not do that because that is rude. We have a response. Wait until he is finished. Look, what we are trying to do here is to point out these concerns and have them recorded. Not to get into a cass cass and a whole debate about it, because this is not the place for it. And the response to the lady's question which I forgot, after this process, as I understand it, these concerns are recorded and they are sent to HAJ or wherever for the public to look at and you have thirty (30) days within which to make written submission.

There is a process. If we can follow the process - the process may be flawed - but if we follow the process we'll get a little further than trying to argue in this room which would get us nowhere. All I want to do is ensure that your concerns are properly recorded in a civil and disciplined fashion.

PARTICIPANT: All right....

CHAIRMAN: Just a minute... I can't hear you, sir, you're not standing. There is a lady at the microphone.

PARTICIPANT: No man, no man, go along.

Are you finished, sir?

MR. BROWN: No, no. All the sewage from this development will quickly reach the holding area that's on the site, not Karachi, the holding site in

the development that is being proposed. It will not stay there long enough to start having any odour problems.

PARTICIPANT: *(Sotto voce comment)*

MR. BROWN: You can't tell me it's not true.

CHAIRMAN: This lady has been waiting long.

The answer is recorded. There is a difference of opinion which has been recorded. The consultant says that it will not be so treated, and there won't be a stench and that is recorded.

Yes, ma'am.

MS. McCAULAY: Can I say something?

MS. WILMOT: My name is Merle Wilmot.

CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry. You may after this lady has asked her question and gotten a response. She has been waiting.

MS. WILMOT: My name is Merle Wilmot from Pines of Karachi. I wonder why the 2001 Population Census was used, and I ask the question to say this, the Pines of Karachi population commenced in 2002; from 2002 onwards.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN: Sorry to interrupt you, ma'am, but I just want to underscore the importance of hearing from everyone. That is a very valid point that needs to be recorded. Thank you.

(Soto voce comment)

No, he did stand up first. Yes, sir.

MR. S. DAWKINS: I'm Stephen Dawkins... oh, you're going to respond?

CHAIRMAN: Oh, I'm sorry; my fault, not yours.

MS. BROWN SMITH: I'm not sure what would be the recommendation because normally when we do these survey studies, the only reference we have is the last census. The last census was 2001. So, if the Pines of Karachi was not developed then we would say that there was a population because seven hundred and seventeen (717) persons were recorded in the general area; might not have been Pines of Karachi but it would have been Karachi Avenue.

PARTICIPANT: No, no.

MS. BROWN SMITH: I'm not sure, but anyway, there are seven hundred and seventeen (717) persons recorded in that ED.

MS. WILMOT: Because I know that you can always get an update from the Statistical Department on population if you need information for anything. A population census was done last year too, although it has not been published yet. But I still think that for us to have

been left out and we are going to be directly affected by what is happening, because nobody in Pines of Karachi was ever interviewed in this...

MS. BROWN SMITH: That is not true.

CHAIRMAN: Sir....

(Soto voce comments)

Order, please. Can we have some order; order please. Thank you

MR. S. DAWKINS: Stephen Dawkins, I am the Chairperson of the Board of Directors for the most controversial community, Long Mountain Country Club.

Again, at the last meeting we had I had expressed some concerns and I came in late, didn't see the entire presentation, but one of the concerns is what Pearline expressed, the sewage system, because I am very close to that and there is sewage system going down as per Mr. Cartade, any addition to that will burst open, sewage will start coming up into our homes.

Secondly, the roads, the moment that that road – that road was not built to take any additional development and any development going towards that road right now will destroy that road.

The concerns coming out of Long Mountain Country Club, apart from the environmental issue is the subdivision issues that are

raised. They think that the subdivision and not a development per say will destroy the entire area and community.

Of course there are a number of other questions, but I will just raise those three points for now. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Response?

MR. BROWN: To my certain knowledge, the gravity flow from the energy dissipating manhole, all the way back to the pumping station is adequate for what is being planned.

The odour problem that is being mentioned is a problem that exists at the moment, as is being expressed here, and is something that should be looked at further, why you are still having that odour problem. But this is the point, it has to be mitigated. It is not something that is going to be just left up in the air like that.

CHAIRMAN: Mitigation will be a precondition, you're saying, of going forward.

MR. BROWN: But it should.

MS. C. COOPER: Carolyn Cooper, again. I wanted to respond to the question about the sewage being collected on the site and there will be no problem.

An earlier environmental assessment, way, way in the past, that has been completely disregarded because it doesn't suit the people who want to run ahead with the development, suggested that

because of the nature of the selling of individual lots, there will be no control over the rate of development and one of the problems with that is that there may not be enough sewage collected in the earlier phase of development to even move down the road. So the whole sewage system will be constipated.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN: No editorial – you are editorializing.

MS. C. COOPER: I am just speaking metaphorically. So, in fact, the claim that the sewage on the site is going to move freely is not accurate because the earlier environmental assessment pointed out the problem of uneven development. So that is one big point. And I just want to tag on my concern about the number of people cited that you looked at in the survey. When you use the 2001 figures, it makes the proportion that is interviewed look much bigger than it would if you were to use a much larger database, because communities must have at least – maybe not doubled but at least fifty per cent (50%) more people in a decade. So it makes it look even worse if it's only fifty (50) people you talk to. I do not know how in clear conscience you could come to us and say that you have interviewed fifty (50) people on a matter of such grave concern for the people in the immediate community and also for the people in the larger Kingston Metropolitan area.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, thank you.

How you going to move from sewage to the berm?

MR. BROWN: Right. Let me just comment on inadequate sewage flows. In most of these subdivisions that are designed as lots, one thing you will never hear complained about is an odour problem. You can tell me of any subdivision that people have complained about an odour problem when you have development that is not seeded? When you have lots...

CHAIRMAN: Let me say that responders are not allowed to pose questions and I will not entertain an answer.

MR. E. DAWKINS: I was about to answer.

CHAIRMAN: No, you can ask a question in your turn. It was a rhetorical question.

MR. BROWN: ...It does not happen. This subdivision, whatever sewage reaches down into the collection area for pumping, is by regulation limited to a certain period of time in terms of when you pump from it, and that period of time does not allow it to get septic so it will smell; does not allow it to get septic so it will smell. The regulations do not allow it. So you can't design a containment area that it is so large that it would give you the problem of odour.

CHAIRMAN: That gentleman after Diana and then you, in order.

(Soto voce comment)

CHAIRMAN: No, but he is responding to Miss Cooper because it is her question.

MS. C. COOPER: What can I say?

CHAIRMAN: No, no, if you have a further question you are allowed to ask one further question.

MS. C. COOPER: The further question is, on what basis are you claiming that the statement that I made coming out of the earlier assessment is inaccurate, where it says that uneven development is going to create sewage problem. On what basis are you saying that that assessment is inaccurate?

MR. BROWN: My forty-odd years of experience.

MS. C. COOPER: That is no comfort.

MR. BROWN: I'm not giving you comfort, ma'am.

CHAIRMAN: The question was asked and the answer was given. Thank you.

Diana.

MS. C. COOPER: So why is the problem in Karachi of stench....

CHAIRMAN: No, ma'am, I won't hear you. I won't hear you.

MS. McCAULAY:

The problem, Mr. Chairman, is that everybody has experience of inadequate regulations so these assurances that we are hearing, we all know is empty noise.

The question of birds is another example of the glossing over that is being done here today. When – and remember this is the environmental impact assessment – I know there are many other concerns, but really, we are here to talk about environmental impact. So on the question of the birds, Mr. Beal says he said there were no threatened migratory species, as if we should all go, oh, well, that's fine then, no threatened migratory species. But this is the process by which birds become threatened because they take out their habitat and they don't have it and that is how they become threatened.

So, simply to say oh, it is some non-threatened ones that we are going to affect, you have been giving the wrong impression and it should not be allowed.

These, the TORs, the Terms of Reference issued by NEPA requires a description of the environmental significance of the location in its broader context, which would include the fact that Jamaica has a large amount of endemic birds and migration. The EIA says the study area supports no less than thirty-nine per cent (39%) of Jamaica's extant endemic bird species.

Now, is anybody sitting in this room going to get that impression from what is being said here? It should not be allowed. It further says...

CHAIRMAN: It is not being allowed, you are recording the contrary.

MS McCAULAY: It's being allowed though, "*The EIA included historical data that suggested the possibility of at least six (6) species of neo-tropical migratory species in the development area,*" these are strong evidence of the environmental significance of the location. An environmental impact consultant is the person who should stand up to defend the environmental aspect of the area. They are sounding like the Housing Authority of Jamaica.

(Applause)

That is why this process is wrong.

CHAIRMAN: I hear you. I take it you are criticizing the study, not the person, because I cannot entertain that.

MS. McCAULAY: No, I'm criticizing the study and the presentation that we heard.

CHAIRMAN: Okay, fine.

MS. McCAULAY: And I am saying the reason we are here, sir, you said it was not to argue and stuff, but in fact it is. The reason we are here is to hear what are the environmental impact of what is proposed, to hear them honestly and frankly from professionals in the field. We

should not be here listening to a sales pitch from the Housing Authority of Jamaica and all these empty assurances.

These are the people that we should rely on to tell us the truth about forest and birds and sewage, instead of which they are glossing over what is actually their own document, really hoping and praying that nobody is going to read it.

So I have recorded that, okay? I think this process is not correct and I again call on the National Environment and Planning Agency to have the Environmental Consultants say what is in their EIA.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

(Applause)

Is there a response? You have asked a question, let her respond.

MS. BROWN SMITH: There is a time constraint...

CHAIRMAN: Hold on.

(Paper change)

MS. BROWN SMITH: There's a time constraint with presentations, and Miss McCaulay, as you have correctly done and mentioned, you have read the document and you know what is in the document and you have indicated what is there. We could not possibly present everything

that is in the document in this presentation so you have brought the rest of the information to the fore, and that is okay.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, ma'am.

MS. P. COOPER SHAND: Because we are now haunted by the sewage and the stench, this gentleman says that there should not have been a stench. I would like to ask him why is there a stench and secondly I want to ask why is it now, only now going to be addressed because of your interest in the proposed Mona, and thirdly I am going to say to you that if you go there right now you'll see where a prospective resident started a building and could not finish it because he could never stay there and a 'for sale' has been up there permanently. Every young child who passes there knows how to spell for sale because they see it every day, every day.

Why is the stench at Pines of Karachi? And the person who put the stench there say you shouldn't touch it at all, okay. So, why is it now going to be rectified only just now, after we have been living there with the stench for over a decade?

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Response?

MR. BROWN: Frankly, I can't imagine why your problem has not been solved. I am not a party to that problem. I am saying that our development will not cause any stench problem in...

MS. C. COOPER: Our development? Our development?

CHAIRMAN: No, no, no, allow him to finish his response...

MS. C. COOPER: No, sir, our development?

CHAIRMAN: Ma'am, I am saying you can rebut, you cannot interrupt.

MR. BROWN: My apologies for...

MS. C. COOPER: It is a clear conflict of interest.

MR. BROWN: My apologies. My words...

MS. C. COOPER: It's a Freudian slip of the greatest proportion...

CHAIRMAN: Miss Cooper, I will not allow you to speak from the floor like that. I will not allow it. Just a minute. For the record, an hour has passed. I am extending this out of consideration for the concerns here. I am not extending it to allow incivility...

MS. C. COOPER: Sir...

CHAIRMAN: So if you have a question, ma'am, address the line and come to the microphone.

MS. C. COOPER: But sir, you have the room booked for four hours, why did you determine that the questions should only last for an hour?

CHAIRMAN: We agreed to that before you came here. If you hadn't been late you would have heard.

MS. C. COOPER: I was here before the meeting started...

CHAIRMAN: We have said an hour, we agreed to an hour...

MS. C. COOPER: You said an hour but we didn't agree...

CHAIRMAN: I didn't hear any dissent...

MS. C. COOPER: You unilaterally said it was going to be an hour...

CHAIRMAN: I did not hear any dissent...

MS. C. COOPER: Can't we have late dissent?

CHAIRMAN: I'll tell you what, if I am not allowed to speak and then you speak, we will not have this session. I am extending the period of time. I volunteered that before you protested, so allow it to happen.

Thank you. Sir?

MR. BROWN: Let me just do one thing, the word 'our' should have been this development. I have no personal interest in this.

This development cannot generate an odour problem. There are design parameters and regulations which govern the situations that create that odour and if you put it in the design, it will not happen. It is as simple as that. The problem that you are having now is something to be addressed separate and apart from the development that we are speaking about; same thing from Mona Great House, *et cetera*.

(Soto voce comment)

MR. BROWN: Yes. I know.

CHAIRMAN: Sir.

MR. E. DAWKINS: Earl Dawkins is the name. On the question of the sewage, I don't think the presentation here about sewage is adequate and that is a very important thing in any development, particularly a residential development. Because I am just trying to gather from the verbal presentation what it is, maybe a schematic drawing would set it straight to person's mind, but what I'm understanding is, on the scheme you'll have a pumping station to pump the sewage to Karachi and then probably pump it somewhere else again, right? When in the first presentation it was just a simple connect to the central sewer of NWC. That sounds like somebody on the flat just have a manhole and you flush your toilet and it go by gravity right down to the sewer plant.

For the presentation, you should be more forthright about how the sewage should be treated. I don't think the verbal presentation of that brought it out.

Next question. On the question of the nine per cent (9%)/two hundred (200) acres that will not be occupied, would you recommend that they put that as a caveat in the title to say that - a

personal guarantee to say that those areas or that area in the lot will not be occupied, by virtue of title?

Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Yes, sir, the sewage collection system is like in every other subdivision in Jamaica. Sewage comes out of the house in a lateral and it goes into a sewer main which runs, usually, down the centre of the road.

In this development, all of that sewage is collected in one location, at the foot of the subdivision. It is pumped from there to a manhole in Karachi that gravity flows the sewage to the Karachi Pump Station. From Karachi, it pumps into the general gravity sewer system that takes it to the treatment plant. That's the system that is there right now.

MR. E. DAWKINS: So, the sewage is treated?

CHAIRMAN: Are there questions?

MR. BROWN: No, not treated, it is lifted. What is happening is you have different elevations, different heights.

MR. E. DAWKINS: Just a point of order, because I think – no, you are saying it is going to a treatment plant in Karachi?

MR. BROWN: No, no, a pump station. It just pumps the sewage from a big manhole, so to speak.

MR. E. DAWKINS: You mentioned that there is a pump station on site?

MR. BROWN: Right.

MR. E. DAWKINS: It goes to a manhole in Karachi?

MR. BROWN: Right.

MR. E. DAWKINS: And it's gravity fed to a treatment plant in Karachi...

MR. BROWN: No, no, no treatment plant.

MR. E. DAWKINS: What is it? A pumping station?

MR. BROWN: Separate treatment plant from a pumping station. A pumping station...

MR. E. DAWKINS: Okay, I am trying to get your word clearly.

MR. BROWN: Right, right.

MR. E. DAWKINS: Because we are at the manhole in Karachi, gravity fed to what, in Karachi?

MR. BROWN: It goes to a pumping station further down in Karachi; pumping station.

MR. E. DAWKINS: Okay. So it passes through two pumping stations, one on site...

MR. BROWN: Right.

MR. E. DAWKINS: ...to the manhole...

MR. BROWN: Right.

MR. E. DAWKINS: ...down to another pumping station.

MR. BROWN: Right.

MR. E. DAWKINS: So the only time it's been treated is when it reach down to our central treatment plan.

MR. BROWN: That's correct, that's correct.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR. E. DAWKINS: The next question.

CHAIRMAN: I'm closing off at 6:30 – I mean 7:30.

PARTICIPANT: He has another question... Chairman...

CHAIRMAN: Just a minute.

MR. E. DAWKINS: Yeah, other question about the...

CHAIRMAN: Before the next question, ladies and gentlemen, the consultants have asked to make a statement and I am going to allow it.

MS. BROWN SMITH: We just wanted to – I notice these comments have been made and raised more than once in the meeting, so we just want to declare and make it clear that we are consultants, we have no personal interest in this project. We record what we find on the ground and that is what it is. So what is there is what it is. If what you hear is

not necessarily what you want to hear, we have no control over that.

So we are just declaring that we are professionals and we are declaring that we found what we found.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Yes, ma'am.

MS. WILLIAMS: Can you say for the record, who commissioned and paid for the EIA? Could you say if the report was read by the developer and commented on before publication and can you state categorically that in your recommendation Rutland Drive is not recommended to be opened up as a street to this development?

MS. BROWN SMITH: The whole process involved liaising with the developer, obviously, because they are the project proponent, so obviously, we have to liaise with them. And as far as I'm aware there are no plans to open Rutland Drive.

MS. WILLIAMS: Okay, can I ask the questions again, who pays for the study?

MS. BROWN SMITH: Well, that is how it operates in Jamaica at the moment, the project proponent pays for the study.

MS. WILLIAMS: Was the report read by the developer and commented on, changed before publication?

MS. BROWN SMITH: Obviously the developer has to read the study to find out what the findings are; not changed but obviously if there are errors or any corrections to be made, yes they are made.

MS. WILLIAMS: And can you state categorically that in your recommendation, Rutland Drive or Montclair Close in Beverly Hills were not recommended to be opened up as roads?

MS. BROWN SMITH: I think there is an original design, but that has since been changed.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Next question.

MR. S. DAWKINS: Stephen Dawkins, again, Long Mountain Country Club. For the last two years, the Long Mountain Country Club has been having - what we call - water problems. In other words, NWC, based on their pumping system, cannot supply adequate water to the community. So, from time to time – luckily, we have a tank on the community, so from time to time we have to cut it off and manage the water supply. With this proposed development, what are the plans to improve the water supply system?

Thank you.

MR. BROWN: NWC would have to address that problem. Once they give the commitment for supply that's all we can go on. We can't instruct them what to do but we will have sufficient capacity in storage on site to deal with the...

MS. WILLIAMS: We?

MR. BROWN: The developer.

MS. McCAULAY: Page 58 of the new EIA, *“in a survey among residents conducted in 2010, most residents (90%) interviewed, were satisfied with the potable water supply. See pages 611. None of these residents expressed fear of a threat to the Mona Reservoir and Mona Treatment Plant by the proposed development.”* The point I’m trying to make about the disconnect between what we are saying and what is written in your EIA.

CHAIRMAN: Response?

Any further questions? One last question.

MR. E. DAWKINS: On the caveat for the title for the reserved section, we didn’t hear any answer if that would be a recommendation.

MS. BROWN SMITH: Well the Housing Agency of Jamaica is represented here and I’m sure they are noting your concerns.

MR. S. DAWKINS: (*Soto voce* comment)

CHAIRMAN: Is it a follow up to your water issue? Make sure it’s a follow up.

MR. S. DAWKINS: It’s a follow up, not the water issue...

CHAIRMAN: But it’s another question. You will have to wait until after this gentleman.

MR. MILLER: Maurice Miller, Pines of Karachi. I have two questions. What is the relationship of the consultancy group here to the issues? Are they retained by the Housing Agency?

CHAIRMAN: I think they answered that question.

MR. MILLER: No, I didn't hear the answer. ...and two, in light of the methodology used in the survey that is obviously flawed, will a new survey method be introduced where the weighting is on the communities that are directly impacted by the development?

(Applause)

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Response?

The first part of the question, who retained you?

MS. BROWN SMITH: I'm not sure, I'm trying to figure out what is the situation in Jamaica. What normally happens when an EIA is done? Is it NEPA that pays the consultants?

MR. E. DAWKINS: No, just answer the question.

CHAIRMAN: No, I'm the Chairman, sir.

MR. E. DAWKINS: She asked the question.

CHAIRMAN: She shouldn't have or I should have stopped her.

MS. BROWN SMITH: I'm sorry, I'm sorry. ..because that is the norm, that is what obtains at the moment.

CHAIRMAN: The answer for the record, they are retained by HAJ.

MS. BROWN SMITH: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: And the other question, which is about the methodology of the survey. What is your intention or your response?

MS. BROWN SMITH: I'm not sure what is the point in surveying the residents in the area – in the immediate vicinity, I am not sure. Because I think there was a survey that was once done. I'm not sure. Maybe I can get the result of that survey then. Maybe it could be incorporated into the study.

CHAIRMAN: All right, and if you have a follow up, and after that ladies and gentlemen...

MR. MILLER: I just wanted to clarify my question on the survey methodology, that I'm just suggesting that perhaps the weighting should be stronger on the affected communities, like Pines of Karachi, *et cetera* and not on Mona Heights because of population.

CHAIRMAN: Point is noted.

Yes, sir?

MR. S. DAWKINS: I actually didn't get a response to the road going up, because I don't know if you are aware, but that road has already started to break away, and in fact Long Mountain, when we were told we owned that road, we were setting aside funds to do the necessary repairs. So what I'm saying to you is, that road has some deep erosion under that any minute now it can fail and then the only access will be through Beverly Hills.

MR. BROWN: Well, I have just taken a note of what you said and I will pass that on to my client for consideration.

MS. WILLIAMS: And in response to your comments or questions about the survey that was done, if you recall at the last public meeting I did mention that we did a survey, at least two hundred (200) people were in that survey, granted it was Beverly Hills, but that was our survey, an input into the process. I pointed out that it existed and asked that you take a look at it and I don't think you did because you are back with – how many? Fifty-four (54) people, thirty-one (31) of them from Mona Heights. And for the record, I just want to say I just think that that is not a study that can be relied on. Again, the gentleman said the people who are impacted most should be the people you talk to about this.

And then also, Mr. Chairman, just finally from me, the roads in Beverly Hills are also of concern if the development is allowed to

go through, in terms of the additional traffic. Those roads were not built to accommodate what's there now, let alone additional people coming on it. The roads are winding. You can go and see for yourself what they look like. They are not roads.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Miss Rowe.

Sorry, beg pardon.

MS. BROWN SMITH: Can I be allowed to respond? For the purpose of the survey, we could not treat Beverly Hills as an enclave. We have to treat all the areas impacted or within, as we call it, the receptor areas. So you are suggesting that we should treat Beverly Hills by itself, as an enclave...

MS. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman, may I please correct that. No, I'm just saying that the survey was done, it is available. It was about four times the number of people that you interviewed and we asked at that public meeting that you take that into consideration. That was all we were asking.

MS. BROWN SMITH: Is there any obvious... well, okay fine.

(Laughter)

MS. BROWN SMITH: Obviously, we want to have a survey that is representative of the receptor community, so we do not want a survey that is skewed for any particular demography. That is just one of the challenges we

have. So we have to balance the challenge of having a survey that is skewed and one that is general.

MISS ROWE: Just for clarification, I have a note ...

CHAIRMAN: Can we have some order please so we can hear what she's saying.

MISS ROWE: ...and I think it would be receptor area, but I am asking for clarification. I have a note that says '**3665 persons in 0.7% of the St. Andrew population**' could you tell us what that information is taken from and how the forty people relate to that number?

CHAIRMAN: You understand? She's saying that the presentation referred to 3665 people as being the total pool - and you are asking how the survey sample relates to that? Sample size is what you are talking about?

MS. BROWN SMITH: As I said before that we took an approximate 1.5 kilometre radius from the site and we looked at all the EDs within that radius and we took roughly one per cent or thereabout from each ED and we came up with that total. So each ED was represented equally.

CHAIRMAN: Okay. I am now going to bring this session to an end. I thank you for your patience and most of you for your discipline.

Thank you.

Meeting ends at 7:40 p.m.