



HOUSING AGENCY OF JAMAICA LIMITED

13 Caledonia Avenue, Kingston 5

Tel: 968-7522-4, 968-7536-9, Fax: 929-5908/ 754-6545, E-mail: info@hajl.gov.jm

PUBLIC PRESENTATION

OF

**ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT
ASSESSMENT (EIA)**

HELD

THURSDAY, JULY 21, 2011

AT

The Courtleigh Hotel and Suite
Kingston, Jamaica



CHAIRMAN:

Good evening ladies and gentlemen. It is just after 6:00 o'clock. We are here to participate in the public presentation of the EIA for the Mona Section I Development by the Housing Agency of Jamaica.

Got a pretty full crowd this evening.

The agenda says that we go until 10:00 o'clock. There is no way this is going to go on until 10:00 o'clock. And I am supposed to make statements for thirty minutes. I won't make statements for five minutes. So I hope the HAJ will indulge me, because we are here to hear EPN speak, not me.

It is my remit to at least get things started and one of the things we would like to share this evening is really to get an overview of the project before Beverline comes on with some details, that this is a development of thirty point nine (30.9) acres out of a total property size of just under two hundred (200) acres.

There is a FAQ provided in the information package that you got coming in. These address some of your main pressing questions, we hope, and you can press into more details after and during the Q&A session.

There is an important point to note in the middle part of the FAQ on the inside, on the fifth point going down, *“sewage generated from the development will be conveyed to the NWC sewer system*

via the Karachi Energy Dissipating Manhole.” Okay. So, let us just get that out of the way.

We also would want to emphasize that this will see the development of fifty-four (54) service lots over the thirty point nine (30.9) acres and that the rest...

MEMBER: Sorry, did.... is it twenty point nine (20.9)?

CHAIRMAN: It's thirty point nine (30.9).

MEMBER: It's grown since last year.

CHAIRMAN: And fifty-four (54) service lots. The rest of the property will be left in trust for use as a National Park.

The role of the HAJ is to provide housing for Jamaica and this is an investment project on the part of the HAJ that will enable it to continue to fulfill its mandate to provide housing to Jamaica.

Over a few - about 2005, more than a few years ago, there was a plan for developing the full two hundred acres and that fell apart. This, I must emphasize, is thirty point nine (30.9) acres, not the full two hundred (200) acres.

This evening we have, like I said, a full house and we have representatives from the Pines of Karachi, from the Long Mountain Country Club, the Mona Heights Citizens Association Cooperative and the Beverly Hills Citizens Association Benevolent Society. We also have the different stakeholders and the participants in the government development approvals process. We have the Water

Resources Authority, I see Basil Fernandez in the back. Is the NWA here as yet? National Works Agency? No. National Water Commission, are they here as yet? Yes. I know Dr Wade is here from ESL, Environmental Solutions. I see Norman Harris from MGD, outside. Is the Environmental Health Unit here? Not yet. We have representatives from the Jamaica National Heritage Trust, right? JNHT is here. ODPEM? Is ODPEM here? Not as yet. KSAC? KSAC is here. Excellent. And Norman, welcome. And we also have the granddaddy of them all, NEPA is here as well. And right now I would like to ask Mr. Ainsley Henry to come to give a statement from NEPA as well as to take us through the NEPA approvals process that will be discussed this afternoon. Ainsley.

MR. HENRY:

Good afternoon ladies and gentlemen. First, let me start by reading this statement that the Agency has:

“On 21 July 2009 the proposed development was declared under Housing Act 1955 by the Honourable Minister of Water and Housing. On 13 October 2009 National Environment and Planning Agency received an application for Environmental Permit (Application No. 2009-02017-EP00234) for the subdivision of 8.4505 hectares into 60 lots (54 service lots and 6 lots for

associated amenities) from the Housing Agency of Jamaica (HAJ).

An Environmental Statement was submitted in support of Environmental Permit Application No. 2009-02017-EP00234, by HAJ to the NEPA. The document was reviewed by NEPA and a decision was made by NEPA that additional information was required. As a consequence NEPA mandated that an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), with the required additional information, be conducted for the proposal. The Terms of Reference (ToRs) for the EIA were submitted and reviewed by both internal and external stakeholders. The Terms of Reference were approved by letter dated 03 June 2011 and addressed to HAJ. The EIA was submitted to the NEPA on 13 June 2011 and circulated for comments externally and within the NEPA. Government agencies to which the document was circulated included:

- Water Resources Authority,*
- Ministry of Health*
- Mines and Geology Division,*

- *National Works Agency; and*
- *Jamaica National Heritage Trust.*

The EIA was also circulated to other stakeholders, including the University of the West Indies and the Beverly Hills Citizens Association Benevolent Society. All entities were given until 19 July 2011 for their comments to be provided to the agency in writing.

To date, the NEPA has received 2 sets of comments, one from the University of the West Indies and another from the Long Mountain Country Club Limited. The comments from the remaining stakeholders are being awaited. Please be advised that any objections, comments and concerns raised will be noted and taken into consideration in the deliberations regarding the development and the processing of the application. The Agency will refrain from making any comments in relation to the development at this time as the application is currently being reviewed by the Agency.

This public meeting is a preliminary action and NO FINAL DECISION has yet been made.

Please be reminded 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 will be submitted to the Agency within five days (5) of the Public Presentation.*
- 2. The public has 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 these comments, they will be collated and sent to the applicant for responses to be provided.*
- 4. When the responses have been received a submission will be prepared by the agency through our internal processes, all the way to the Technical Review Committee which is made up of all the commenting agencies for a decision to be taken by the National Resources Conservation Authority.*

The public presentation and public consultation process is an extremely important part in the processing and decision making process for Environmental Permit applications and for which an

EIA has been requested. It is the opinion of the NEPA that the public presentation will provide an additional opportunity for stakeholders to air concerns / comments / opinions / views on this development. It will also provide the applicant with the opportunity to address these concerns / comments / opinions / views that have been expressed.

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

- *NEPA's Documentation Center*

- *NEPA website*

http://www.nepa.gov.jm/eias/StAndrew/Mona_Papine_Estate/mona_papine.pdf

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

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

Now, with respect to the application process, I don't know if you want me to go into tremendous details. What I will say here is that where we are at this stage in the process is approximately half way through. We have gone through the initial process of screening the application, of determining whether or not an EIA was required;

getting their Terms of Reference through the process approved so that the EIA could be done, and now we are at the review of the Terms of Reference phase with a view to getting the final bit of information that we need to move it through the Internal Review and Technical Review Committees to the NRCA.

Thank you.

MS. ADAMS: Excuse me. Can I ask a question? You mentioned a July 19th date. Was that the Ministry of Water?

MR. HENRY: Yes.

MS. ADAMS: To whom?

MR. HENRY: Everybody that the EIA was sent to; it came with a cover letter.

MS. ADAMS: I have the cover letter, it doesn't have July 19th.

MR. HENRY: Not the letter from HAJ, the letter from NEPA.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Ainsley.

Right now we want to go into the presentation of the EIA. Beverline Brown-Smith, from EPN, will make the presentation and carry you through it.

The EIA will look at the different physical, natural hazards, social infrastructural issues associated with the development and afterward we will have a Q&A session. May I ask that we hold our questions until afterwards and then we ask our questions once Beverline has completed her presentation.

EPN has been around for over a decade and so I look forward to seeing the presentation by EPN. Beverline.

MRS. BROWN-SMITH: Welcome again everybody, for the presentation of these findings of the Environmental Impact Assessment for the proposed Mona Section 1 Development.

The Project Proponent

This is a project of the Housing Agency of Jamaica Limited in fulfilling its mandate through its vision to be an effective, financially viable and environmentally responsible housing solution facilitator and provider by 2013.

Now, where is Mona Section 1 located? It is located approximately three miles east of Half Way Tree on the Mona Estate, actually, on Long Mountain or Warika Hills. It is flanked or nestled between Long Mountain Country Club to the south, Pines of Karachi to the north and Beverly Hills to the east. It is west of the main road that leads from the Pines of Karachi to the Long Mountain Country Club. You can see it from the picture there. So, this is the area in red and to the south is the Long Mountain Country Club. To the north we have the Pines of Karachi.

This Public Presentation is only one of the processes in the entire process of public participation and consultation.

As you can see from this diagram, here is the preview of discussions in the public domain. There are face-to-face interviews, there are telephone calls, there is a community survey. From the community survey we highlighted two of the questions. To my left is the first that involved asking persons what they consider their main concerns if the development should proceed. And you noticed that traffic congestion was the greatest concern, forty per cent (40%), and none was the second greatest response at thirty per cent (30%).

On the right, that chart indicates what persons think that property should be used for. Over fifty percent (50%) or fifty-eight per cent (58%) thought it should be used for housing and a third thought it should remain as is, or as a green area.

I'll now proceed to describe the project. The property comprises over two hundred (200) acres as was mentioned earlier and the actual area of development is just about thirty/thirty-one (30/31) acres. And this represents roughly thirteen (13) or just about fourteen (14) per cent of the actual area that is owned by HAJ.

The Main Activities or the Main Lot Uses

As you can see it is fifty-four (54) residential service lots ranging from quarter acre upwards and there is a recreational area - one lot. There is an area for a retention pond – well, I would say retention/detention because of recent communication from the WRA where

approximately eighty per cent (80%) of the storm water from the property will be directed.

There is – well, I'm trying to count the sixty (60) lots here. There is an existing telecom facility that comprises one lot and there are three lots that are reserved for the tank. There is a new tank to be constructed to the south. This is a subdivision plan. I don't know which is easier for one to read, it's here or there, but I mentioned earlier, the open space for the retention area which is up here and across there is an open space that will also provide some access for that use as well.

To the south is the area proposed for recreation, and across from this area you have the tanks. There are two tanks already existing and a new one would be built for the development.

Also there is a total of four service roads. This was an existing road and there is an additional three roads. Sorry, not service roads, there are actually four reserved roads and there is one service road; the service road following along the existing main road and it allows for circulation within the development without having to actually enter on to the main road.

As regards the project infrastructure, the main access road is the Long Mountain Karachi Road. Potable water will be supplied by NWC and they have recommended that a sixty (60) gallon storage tank be built – sixty thousand (60,000) gallon storage tank.

Waste disposal - with respect to sewage, NWC will treat sewage through its central sewage system.

Roadside landscaping – that is that area opposite the proposed site. It is recommended that an area up to thirty (30) feet be reserved for landscaping. That would reduce the visual impact on the proposed new community members.

For the recreational area, it will be designed for active open spaces. For drainage, we will discuss that in the next two slides.

This image gives us an indication of the drainage and how it is to be treated from the development site. The location of the retention/detention pond is approximately in this area and when there is overflow, and it is not anticipated that there is overflow unless there are extreme weather events, it will flow into that gully or depression just across the road, would continue to the foot of Long Mountain where there is actually a drain that captures water that flows from this area. You can see this photograph image as you go along. It continues and gets to the Pines of Karachi and then joins - this stream joins with another coming from the Karachi community up here and then continues further down to the Mountain View Gully.

So, you'll see there are actually two connections as you go along here. This is where Mountain View Gully continues.

This image now gives another view of the movement of surface water from this proposed site.

This shows the topographic overlay and this is an indication of the original flow to flow from here across, but as you see, this road is the Long Mountain to – well the Karachi to Long Mountain Road and you'll see that during construction of that road this impression was along the road alignment. So you had some damage over here. So it is no longer a free flow from this area into the gully.

These are some correspondence from the various agencies that have indicated no objections or their comments on the proposal. This first letter is from the NWC and highlighted there, you will see that the NWC advised that it does not basically see a problem with the development. It should be able to deal with the potable water and sewage disposal services from this site.

This letter is from NWA and it also indicated its approval for the proposal. There is a letter from Mines and Geology that - let's go back to the previous slide - that was dated August 24, 2009, when they indicated at the time that the Mines and Geology Division offers no objection to the subdivision, in principle.

This is some previous correspondence as well from the WRA that indicated that there is no risk of flooding from the site.

You will see also, this is a most recent letter from the WRA that in addition to their support for the proposal, they have added some additional requirement for the retention/detention area.

I hope you can see that but it is just an additional requirement just to ensure that there is no possibility of storm water runoff from the property that would impact negatively, adjacent property.

In this section we'll describe the existing environment, and it was addressed from the physical, biological, human and social, heritage and the natural hazard aspects.

Physical

First of all, you look at the geological formation and in particular the stratigraphy. From this map you can see that the two main types of limestone formation are the Newport and the Gibraltar-Bonnygate Limestone Formation, the dominant formation on the site. This one that is in pink here, is the Newport White Limestone.

Actually – well, if you can see, it's kind of embedded in the image here for the site, but it is the Newport White Limestone that is the dominant one there.

For topography - from this image it gives you an idea of the site - this is the site here - the image as you can probably tell, gives some other connotation but it is actually approximately eighty per cent (80%) of the land mass that is on the slope. The average slope

gradient is fourteen per cent (14%) or twenty-five per cent (25%) and elevation is up to twenty – sorry, two hundred and sixty (260) metres above sea level.

With respect to soils, the site is underlaid by the Bonnygate Stony Loam and that covers all of that area: Pines of Karachi, Beverly Hills, Long Mountain Country Club.

The root limit to the bedrock is roughly one to twelve inches (1-12”) and the soil, although it has high erosion capacity, it also experiences very rapid internal drainage.

Hydrology and Specific Surface Drainage

There is no perennial surface drainage system. The area proposed for the retention/detention is possible due to the dam effect created along the road alignment that is Karachi Avenue to Long Mountain Road.

Artificial drainage features along the access road include kerb and gutter and gridded inlets across the main road. Images will follow.

This shows site drainage and it shows here that the directional flow on the property is towards the north – towards that retention/detention area. So most of the drainage from the property flows in this direction, into this area.

And this next image shows the drainage in the adjacent area. You’ll see here this line actually shows that there is some drainage from this area toward the Mona Reservoir and then this line in

black shows a channel that drains towards the east of the main road and towards this other channel that it joins that was originally a part of the drainage system that flows from the proposed development site. This continues – this will follow as we showed earlier, into this area along the path beside here. These are some of the existing drainage structures. These show the cross drain spillway into the property and this is in fact the drainage channel or the gully at the foot of the Long Mountain that eventually flows towards Karachi.

Groundwater

The dominant perennial drainage is underground and based on that there is an aquifer where there is significant groundwater storage and movement under normal hydrologic conditions. The depth to groundwater is approximately a hundred and three (103) metres below ground level.

The Natural Hazards

We considered both natural – well, it was both natural as well as geological hazards. Firstly, earthquakes: there is some historical evidence of earthquakes and their impact in the area. You will see there was an earthquake in January 1993 and there was some damage to the NWC's facility.

With respect to the flooding – flood susceptibility at the proposed site is very low and this was confirmed by ODPEM in July 2011, that is this month.

We looked at slope failure - Newport and Walderston Limestone are very stable at steep angles. However, there are minimal areas that there could be some slope failure; erosion, chalky and nodular formation make it susceptible to erosion by water.

And this is a second page of the letter from ODPEM that confirms that the site is not on the ODPEM's list of high risk areas and there are also some additional recommendations that will be observed.

Biological

Firstly, vegetation: The vegetation in the area is described as degraded, dry limestone forest. That means it was exposed to previous degradation. The site is covered by dry limestone secondary growth with few, as mentioned, trees. Overall tree diversity is low.

This map shows the area. Most of the area is in green, which is degraded forest and this area to the north is scrub.

Fauna

A total of twenty-eight (28) species were identified on the site; eleven (11) are endemic and eight (8) are Jamaican endemic sub-species. These bird species however are not unique to the site.

And, overall, bird species diversity is low, due to the relatively poor condition of the vegetation.

These are some of the endemic species that were observed at the site.

Heritage

There is no issue there. This was confirmed by the Jamaican National Heritage Trust in June of 2010.

Human and Social

We will just point out here that for the receptor community we approximate that roughly three thousand six hundred and sixty-five persons (3665) which is zero point seven per cent (0.7%) of the population of St. Andrew.

The main issue that we found here was the possible demand for housing accommodation, in that, with the UWI and UTECH campuses with over twenty thousand (20,000) students, there could be a demand – well a challenging demand for housing in the area, in addition to traffic. After five years it is projected that just about one vehicle per minute would be added to the roadway, with the new development on stream.

For Landscape and Visual Impact

The small size of the subdivision means that the scale of the impact is not excessive, especially given the adjacent land uses. Here we looked at the significant impact and mitigation measures proposed.

We looked at flooding, mainly on site flooding. There could be some impact, or presently there is some impact from flooding from the Long Mountain Country Club. That's the flow that's coming down the hill that actually impacts the site. You did see the spillways earlier and the proposal is for an appropriate engineering solution using LEED principles, where appropriate.

In addition, there is some flooding on Rutland Drive in Beverly Hills and the flow to the site could accommodate the flow from that area on to the site into the retention/detention proposed.

There is also some adjustment made to the spillways in order to accommodate the new development.

For drainage - we mentioned earlier about this retention pond where excess water from any overflow in the event of extreme weather events would flow from that area into the drains at Pines of Karachi and eventually into the Mountain View Gully.

It should be noted also that the natural depression would accommodate up to eighty percent (80%) of storm water flows from the site and in addition, the excess is also a point of infiltration that would effectively recharge the local aquifer.

Safety

This actually relates to the location of the recreation area across the road. So, we have said that there should be some protection for those crossing and at least a pedestrian crossing should be in place.

Land Use

In the EIA we mentioned tradeoffs. These are the five areas that we would recommend if one were to consider any tradeoff with respect to the development proceeding:

1. Given the high demand for residence
2. The small scale proposal
3. Ensure that all environmental impact would be addressed and balanced
4. Property would be left for conservation of open space uses

Residual Impact

We identified two and that would be any potential impact, residual impact upon the existing drainage structure during the design or during the construction of the new drainage structure. The developer, I'm sure, would ensure that any improvement would not impact negatively, the existing one.

In addition to traffic, I know that based on survey there is some concern from the citizens in Beverly Hills on the impact on the traffic and not just them, in the general area. So it is recommended that the Long Mountain Karachi be the access road for the site and that will reduce the flow on the Beverly Hills roadways.

Cumulative Impact

One cumulative potential impact that looked at previous development and proposed development would be reducing the

yield from the construction as well as the impact, although the site initially would produce that cumulative impact with the proposal for a recharged detention area that will provide some amount of recharge for the aquifer. That impact should be reduced if the project goes ahead.

Monitor and Management

If the development were to proceed, there are a number of impacts that one would have to ensure are mitigated. And the indicators are mentioned there; the targets and the persons who will be responsible. And these address health and safety, noise, solid waste, sewage treatment, traffic control, building plans, floods and erosion control, construction material. So this is to ensure that the development proceeds without any unnecessary impact of the environment or the persons around.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN:

Thank you, Beverline.

At this point we'll open for questions and answers. There is a microphone set up in the middle. We ask that to ask your questions you come to the microphone, state your name and organization and ask your question to Beverline or to any of the other stakeholders who are present.

Any questions?

MS. ADAMS :

I do.

CHAIRMAN: Name and organization.

MS. ADAMS: My name is Faval Adams and I'm the President of the Beverly Hills Citizens Association. Good afternoon everyone.

In your presentation, you said that the... in your very first line you talked about the percentage of the people you interviewed and what they said. For the record, could you say how many people exactly were interviewed?

MS. BROWN-SMITH: Actually that was an over sight. I apologise. It was actually forty-two (42) persons in the sample.

MS. ADAMS: Forty-two (42). Can you say where they were from?

MS. BROWN-SMITH: They are roughly within the area of point seven five (.75) to one point five (1.5) miles radius of the site and we did not go over the hill because naturally outside the sphere of influence of the site, so we stayed more towards the east.

MS. ADAMS: And were you aware that there was a survey done in Beverly Hills, over two hundred (200) residents, we collected signatures and we turned those into NEPA. Was that information made available to you, in terms of concerns?

MS. BROWN-SMITH: No, it was not. But for my purposes, obviously your survey, I assume it would be skewed because it is just the people in Beverly Hills and we had to look at a wider cross section of the population in our sample.

MS. ADAMS: I wasn't asking you to use that alone. I was just saying, were you aware of that?

MS. BROWN-SMITH: No, I had not seen it. No.

MS. ADAMS: You also talked about eighty per cent (80%) of the storm water that is going to be directed into the retention area, where is the other twenty (20%) going?

MS. BROWN-SMITH: Twenty per cent (20%) would follow the...

CHAIRMAN: Barry.

MR. BROWN: Barry Brown, Consultant, EPN. The other twenty per cent (20%) would flow to the gully that is on the other side of the roadway, on the right hand side, going downhill.

MS. ADAMS: Towards the reservoir?

MR. BROWN: No, no flow goes towards the reservoir.

MS. ADAMS: You said on the right hand side going....

MR. BROWN: The right, going down. There is a gully that runs on the right in blue. That twenty per cent (20%) that does not go into the catchment area for the retention pond would flow over and run into that gully. No, sorry. Lend me your pointer a second. Yes, please.

This is the road going down here and this is the natural drainage here which is a gully running all the way down here and then turns towards here with the water flow. So that twenty per cent (20%) that you are not getting into the area down here would be flowing

across here and across the road and down here in the cross drains, goes across the road down in the gully and all the way up... okay, right. Just bear with me a minute.

This is the site we are talking about. That's the depression you have in the hillside and it goes back up into a hill and then down into the reservoir and that same profile you're looking at there, gets steeper as you come down through here. So there is no chance of it going...

CHAIRMAN: So you are saying this is a ridge right here?

MR. BROWN: Yes, ridge, ridge, gully; it's as basic as that.

MS. ADAMS: Okay, just one final thing. Just for the record, I have the letter from NEPA that was sent to the Beverly Hills Citizen's Association and it talks about a Friday 22nd of July deadline date to respond. Not a July 19th date. So if there are people who got a July 19th, Beverly Hills did not get a July 19th date and I'm reading from the cover letter. So if there are different dates that went out to people, I don't know.

CHAIRMAN: NEPA wants to respond.

MR. HENRY: No.

CHAIRMAN: Okay. Next question, please.

Could you give your name and association.

MRS. COOPER SHAW SHAW: Sheryl Cooper Shaw from the Pines of Karachi. I want to categorically state that the Pines of Karachi is not against any

housing solution because we are the beneficiaries of housing solutions. As long as all the Ts are crossed and the Is are dotted, because right now we are the victims of cumulative effects of a nearby development. The persons from that development, I'm sure, are oblivious to the problems we face at Pines of Karachi.

For example, when I look here, that - I'm not very technical in this area, so if the wrong words are used, could you correct me or try to see what I'm saying - the dissipating manhole is a cancer at Pines of Karachi. It is a disgrace and it is an affront to any community to have put a dissipating manhole on a residential lot. It emanates the most offensive odor twenty-four seven (24/7) and it is untenable. And I am seeing here, based on my meager knowledge that it is going to be... I see where sewage from the development will be conveyed to the NWC system via the Karachi Energy Dissipating Manhole.

I'm sure we would all vacate that place if this so, but we invited NWC to have a look at it. I will not state at this time what they said. They will state it themselves.

The roads, over a decade now Pines of Karachi is here and to date, we have not been handed over to the KSAC. We are an abandoned self supporting community. We fix our roads ourselves, we put in our tar, sometimes cement when we can't afford the tar. We do everything ourselves.

Recently, when we got no help we went to the Minister of Local Government and he has assisted us in cleaning some of our drains. One of the manholes – the drains I hear you are talking about, I don't know if I'm correct, is one at the top of some – a hill coming from Beverly Hills where it has no concrete at the back and during the last rain four houses were washed out from water coming from that place.

So, I am just saying what we are suffering now and that if this housing becomes a reality, then there are many, many, many things that will have to be done.

When I read about it in the papers I immediately wrote to the Minister of Housing and told him the concerns we have.

The road leading from Long Mountain to Pines of Karachi is a private road. It is not gazetted, and so we could be very unfriendly and block it once per year – one day per year, as the University does. We do not do that. We do not do that because we are all Jamaicans and we have to get to and fro. It's a private non-gazetted road that we fix.

Right now, there are potholes that the cars have to be hop, skipping and jumping to go and although it is used by all and sundry, we have to fix those roads.

The sewage system, NWC came, I asked them for an evaluation of the whole infrastructure of the sewage system of Pines and it

leaves much to be desired. You're just walking about and you see it bubbling, bubbling, bubbling.

About two (2) years ago there was a constant flow of sewage from Long Mountain into the houses of people in Pines of Karachi. My meager knowledge tells me that the lowness of the pipes, the large pipe coming from Long Mountain that is fixed to ours in Pines is incongruous - big Pipe coming down with feces into small pipe and so the feces found its way right into people's houses.

Those are the things that we still – although NHDC tried to assist in that area - we still suffer from those things. So I spoke to the Minister in this letter I wrote to him and he replied. I told him that there are certain things that must be mandatory - preliminary stages access roads. We cannot walk on our streets, it's like Dover. We have put in - our own money used to put in speed bumps. One cost nearly a hundred thousand (100,000). We now have three (3). The Minister of Local Government assisted us with two (2) but there is a hill where either the residents or their visitors from nearby communities use as testing for their cars. And I could go on and go on.

So, the roads, the traffic, the sewage, the water but most of all, the manhole. So I see everything leading down through the Pines.

When Long Mountain was developed, the developer went and barber greened Karachi Avenue that he had damaged and ignored the Pines of Karachi that was even more damaged.

If you say the housing solutions will take six (6) months to completion, right now our roads are defaced with premix material. I can hardly go into my gate because I'm on the hill and the premix material and the building material and the early morning truck and the late at night truck and the woo, woo permanently.

At the entrance to the Pines of Karachi there is a drain that is not properly placed and so every two months we have to fix it. The last time it was fixed, the Minister had to pretend that it was from Karachi Avenue because NWA does not have our community on their list.

So we fixed our drains, we fixed our roads, we continue to use masks to prevent the smell from the dissipating manhole and we do everything. We are a self supporting, abandoned community and we pay our taxes, we are law abiding and over ten years now we have not yet been handed over to the KSAC and that is something that is an affront to any person.

So, let me repeat categorically, we are recipients of housing solutions and persons in Jamaica need houses. But before you embark on this, because I'm sure it's going to happen, every

technical person here needs to come and have a walk through at the Pines of Karachi.

I have not finished, but I will not speak any longer at this time.

CHAIRMAN: One second. Beverline, do you want to respond to any of the particular comments?

Thank you for your comments.

Go ahead.

MS. BROWN-SMITH: Well, I'm not really in a position to answer those issues that she raised.

CHARIMAN: There are representatives of KSAC and NWA, would any of them care to comment?

MRS. COOPER SHAW: We had a walk through with NWC and some of our problems are created by them – I'm just being very honest. We had a walk through with KSAC after about twelve (12) years of writing and asking for recognition. It wasn't complete because the sun was so hot; a walk through, over twelve (12) years we have been asking for that and they came sometime this month - early this month or late last month. Somebody from the HAJ came with them but they are to return.

So we have nothing there to accommodate anything else. We cannot even now accommodate ourselves.

CHAIRMAN: Diana McCaulay.

MRS. McCAULAY: I'm Diana McCaulay and I'm from the Jamaica Environmental Trust and I want to start by thanking Ainsley Henry for standing up and making such a clear statement from the National Environment and Planning Agency and emphasizing that no decision has been taken and this is part of the decision making process.

And I have gone to a lot of public meetings in my time and it is the first such statement I recall from NEPA. So thank you Mr. Henry and Mr. Knight for guiding us correctly.

My... sorry, question – sorry, I don't know if you introduced yourself... Mrs..?

MRS. BROWN-SMITH: Brown-Smith.

MRS. McCAULAY: ...Brown-Smith, in EIA there are statements about conformance or lack of conformance - breaches, actually, of the 1966 Development Order and the 2008 Development Order. Is that correct?

MRS. BROWN-SMITH: Yes.

MRS. McCAULAY: Which, I don't think you had dealt with in your presentation. I think that's an omission; a grave omission.

Really, what I want to say is that people in this room may have had the benefit of travelling and perhaps walk – enjoyed Central Park in New York, Hyde Park in London, even the Savannah Park of Trinidad. And the reason that those areas are still there is because of an uncompromising approach to the designations of green spaces. And the way green space is lost is exactly how this is

proceeding; incremental approach where we are assured that it is only a small piece of a much larger piece and then the next piece to come along we are told well, the first piece was approved and therefore we really don't have a basis on which to stop the second piece and so on and so on. And I basically came to say that Kingston is – we have lost far too much available green space.

In many parts of the island there are not the required planning instruments so there are not up to date Development Orders and so it is difficult really to hold on to the green space.

This is not true in this case and I cannot think of a reason a recent development order that has this land designated a green space – open space should be breached, pretty much before the ink is dry upon it.

So that really is what I came to say. We have concerns about the details of the EIA. We think there are inconsistencies in them. We think some of the way the information is presented in maps, it needs to be corrected.

I think one of the things EIA will tell you is, don't breach development orders. So that really is what I came to say. It is not a question, it's a statement. We should hang on to every last remaining bit of our green space, because we have lost so much and this is going to breach a recent Development Order.

CHAIRMAN:

Beverline.

MRS. BROWN-SMITH: Yes, Mrs. McCaulay, I heard your statement and the project proponent, I'm sure, is listening. But my role as an Environmental Impact Assessment Consultant as you can see, is to state it as it is and suggest mitigation measures as you have noted.

CHAIRMAN: Any other questions? Could you identify yourself and organization.

MR. THOMPSON: My name is Paul Thompson, speaking on behalf of the Chairman, Long Mountain Country Club Limited.

We have heard the issues related to sewage and drainage and so on, but fundamentally, we have reviewed the EIA documentation and we had some issues with the way the actual EIA was conducted; speaking more to the accuracy of the basis for the EIA. Someone had mentioned the Public Consultation. I think there is some standard in terms of, I think, four per cent (4%) of what we estimate the population to be in that general area.

I noticed that in the EIA, there is reference to three thousand six hundred and sixty-five (3665) people taken from a census prior to the construction of Long Mountain Country Club, which added at least - maybe fifteen hundred/two thousand (1500/2000) people and Pines of Karachi. So, I think that there is definitely some consideration about the accuracy of the data going from that point.

It is also noted that background baseline assessments were either not done or very basic in their delivery.

I think there was one point that was done for five (5) minutes. Traffic was done at one point for, I think, maybe a day. We think that the basis of the EIA could be flawed, based on these types of issues.

There is mention of drainage. Another couple of quick areas; there was mention in the hurricane section, that the hazard vulnerability will be done and it says, "...*will be done*." It didn't give any reference that it was done or that the work is included in the discussions for the EIA.

There was no mention of blasting at all in the entire EIA, as far as I know. Does that mean that blasting will not be a feature of the development, because that has its potential for impact. We just wanted a statement on that.

Upgrading of the Drainage System – it says that,

"In the medium to long term, there appears to be no need for the upgrading of the offsite drainage structures. However, a drainage flood impact assessment would become necessary if subsequent rainfall events prove that engineering structures prove inadequate."

That sounds a little dangerous because I think it sounds like we are going to wait until something floods out before we make some attempt to fix it.

There are a few others but I don't want to prolong. I think we need to look at the...

CHAIRMAN:

I think we need to hear the few others.

MR. THOMPSON:

All right. Another one, it has to do with the reference of the Mona Road classified as a Class B road, which would normally carry five hundred to two thousand (500-2000) vehicles on average daily. Yet the NWA traffic survey for March 2001, which was used in the EIA, shows daily traffic flows of over nineteen hundred vehicles on that said roadway, with one hour peak averages of over two thousand (2000) vehicles. So the peak averages exceed the carrying capacity of the road even before we consider anything else, in that regard.

The area to the north that - I'm a little confused because I'm not sure if it's being referred to as a gully or a natural drainage feature, but there is actually a manmade conveyance that carries water from the west to the east which comprises two (2) thirty-six inch (36") concrete pipes.

And there was mention in the EIA report however of the gabion basket, but there is no mention of those two (2) thirty-six inch (36") pipes that convey water across the roadway.

Now, the problem is that when we have heavy rainfall in the Long Mountain area, that area gets inundated extremely easily and in the event we add more concrete structures and less ability for storm

water to dissipate or to slow its flow, then I'm sure we are going to have a problem in that area. And again, I didn't see a mention of the pipes at all in that section.

So again, I don't want to just keep going, because we can sit and really pick at this thing, but there are a lot of areas that are significant in terms of the design, in terms of the practicality of this development going in place that I think needs to be looked at just a little bit more before we can approve any ideas such as these.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

Beverline, I know you can address on several things, but if you could address the blasting issue.

MRS. BROWN-SMITH: There is no proposal for blasting. Based on my communication, it is not expected that there will be blasting. There are no plans for blasting.

CHAIRMAN?: Could you explain the mechanics for clearing/preparation of the lots?

MR. BROWN: Generally, in the area protection drilling, back up excavation with a drill, break objects and move it off site.

CHAIRMAN: Okay. And there are several other issues regarding traffic, regarding the pipeline.

MRS. BROWN-SMITH: May I have your name, again, sir?

MR. THOMPSON: Paul Thompson.

MRS. BROWN-SMITH: If only I had your name when we were doing the survey. We could not get access to Long Mountain Country Club. We were at that gate for minutes and nobody would allow us in. Eventually we said, okay, you guys are going to be impacted and you don't want to let us in. What can we do?

MRS. COOPER SHAW: I just want to ask if persons from the Pines of Karachi were interviewed?

MRS. BROWN-SMITH: Yes.

MRS. COOPER SHAW: How many?

MRS. BROWN-SMITH: About six (6) or seven (7).

But could I just address the additional issues from Mr. Thompson. Well, what I would recommend is, NEPA is here and I am sure you can direct your concerns to NEPA. NEPA will in turn communicate them to the consultants to be addressed.

I'm sure that is how the process works.

MRS. COOPER SHAW: My concerns were not addressed. Nobody spoke after I spoke.

MRS. BROWN-SMITH: Your concerns are not actually...

CHAIRMAN: The question was, "how many people..?"

MRS. COOPER SHAW: No, no. She gave that number but I said - the myriad of concerns that I had presented, nobody...

MRS. BROWN-SMITH: No, because these relate.... he mentioned specifically EIA. Your concerns related to your particular community.

CHAIRMAN: She is speaking about EIA.

Beverline, that is really not in your terms of reference?

MRS. BROWN-SMITH: Outside the EIA.

MRS. COOPER SHAW: We have some major concerns and I'm inviting every member of the technical team to come for a walk through of the Pines of Karachi, as a matter of urgency.

CHAIRMAN: That has been noted.

Name and organization, please.

MR. DAWKINS: Good evening, I am Stephen Dawkins, the Chairman of the Long Mountain Country Club Limited.

Like my lovely lady here, Long Mountain Country Club is not opposed to any housing development. However, we have certain concerns, as my able Property Manager just mentioned. One of the things that wasn't, and we need to get a proper clearing on it, is the sewage system that exists, because, yes, even the residents, just driving down in the morning, we do smell the sewage.

Now, prior to this meeting, I had a conversation with the developer who expressed to me that the sewage system – I'm not technical, so I am just speaking in non-technical terms – the sewage pipes that go down to Karachi are very small and as such it – anything being added to it, it won't be able to carry the weight.

So what I need to understand is if there will be another system added? If it will be added, will it be along the roadway at the side? Where? I don't... these are things that we need to understand and

my property manager expressed some other concerns, but I think this is a key concern to residents.

And as the Chairman also Beverly Hills Citizens Association, Pines of Karachi, I believe we all could unite and bring our concerns together, because the fact of the matter is, these things are there and we need to pull together to ensure that our cause are answered.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

And again, we are hearing the same thing from Pines of Karachi and the Long Mountain Country Club president.

Beverline, do you have anything specific to say to them? Barry?

MR. BROWN: I think what should happen out of this is a specific investigation of that route from the Energy Dissipating Manhole down to the existing Lift Station because I wasn't aware that they were having an odor problem out of that particular manhole just mentioned.

CHAIRMAN: And the issue also warrants a wider role of NWC in taking on this thing.

Name and association, please.

MR. WILLOUGHBY: Gary Willoughby, Beverly Hills.

My question is more a process one, but there are representatives from various agencies here that have some say in the development and I'm hoping that other agency heads will stand up and answer

questions that are outside the purview of the EIA, because we want answers.

So my question is about process. Mrs. McCaulay touched on it.

You guys said this is not a done deal and this meeting here tonight and the objections that are being voiced and concerns will have an impact on the decision that is finally made.

Can somebody really convince me that this is so? I mean, tell me that you guys are going to stop a development with all these considerable concerns and objections that are being raised. You guys can clearly say to me tonight and all of us here, that if the concerns are of the magnitude where they cannot be addressed, the development will be stopped. Can somebody from NEPA say that to me or HAJ? No answer.

CHAIRMAN:

Faval again.

MS. ADAMS:

Faval Adams, again, Beverly Hills.

I just want to put on record that the Beverly Hills Citizens Association objects to the development and we object to it primarily on environmental grounds. It's an environmentally sensitive area and as Mrs. McCaulay talked about, we agree with everything she said. *"The site falls within the land use zoned private or public open space that serves to prevent encroachment on the NWC's Mona Reservoirs and the Mona Water Treatment Plant,"* Page 71 of the report.

Why are we looking to do further development here? The report talks about the potential for slope movement occurring and rockslide as access roads are cut and hard rock areas excavated.

Why are we going down the road of doing more development?

We talked a lot about the runoff and the drainage. That's a major concern that the Beverly Hills Citizens support as well in terms of the impact on the community.

But what I want to ask, I compared the site assessment that was done last year versus the EIA that's done this year. The site assessment last year talked about, I think you have to go to Page 8:

“In consideration of the zoning requirement, the developer proposes the development of only eight point zero nine three seven (8.0937) hectares or twenty (20) acres of its property confining itself to the existing roadways.”

Now we are hearing thirty (30) that an additional ten (10) in the space of a year, or two hundred and eleven (211) acres. At that rate, in ten years we are going to wake up and the entire mountain side is going to be plastered with houses. We might wake up and the Mona Reservoir is concreted over with houses on top of it at the rate they are going.

So, can somebody answer the question about why last year we went from – well, the HAJ went from saying only twenty (20)

acres to now thirty plus (30+) acres, and based on your map, they have even now included this recreational area across the street, when last year they were saying none of the lands across the street will be considered in terms of development. Is that encroachment? I just want the question answered. Why in the span of a year the developer is talking about an additional ten (10) acres?

CHAIRMAN:

Okay, so Beverline, there are really two questions here regarding the increase from twenty (20) to thirty (30) as well as the statement about developing environmentally sensitive areas. So could you answer those questions?

Is that correct?

MS. ADAMS:

Yes.

MRS. BROWN-SMITH:

The first relates to the increase in size. That has to do with the fact that the initial proposal was for this area alone, west of the main road and I think NEPA requirements for open space was adhered to in the eventual design, hence there is an expansion of the area.

MS. ADAMS:

So, it's suggested you should reduce it, not expand it.

MRS. BROWN-SMITH:

No, let me explain. This is actually passive open space – this is active open space but should be landscaped accordingly and I think the proposal is important to retain as much as possible of the existing character of the area.

MS. ADAMS: But you see the kind of silliness of it all? I mean you're starting out with twenty (20). NEPA said you need some green spaces, so you go get ten more of the environmentally sensitive area.

MRS. BROWN-SMITH: Well I can only explain to you the rationale for increasing the area that was originally proposed, because in order to have a viable development...

CHAIRMAN: So, it's still the same fifty-four (54) lots?

MRS. BROWN-SMITH: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: And the other question was about the environmentally sensitive areas.

MRS. BROWN-SMITH: We already pointed out in the EIA that is an area, public open space, according to the Development Order and as the EIA mentioned, are there any possibility for tradeoffs? That was the question asked.

MS. ADAMS: Were there any tradeoffs?
While you are looking for that, I read through the entire report and pages after pages listed the environmentally sensitive nature of it. It also listed a number of different things, it lists carbon sinking, it goes on and on and on, yet still at the end of it the conclusion is, we can do a tradeoff.

MRS. BROWN-SMITH: Actually, if you look back at the presentation you will see that it was stated clearly that the area is degraded in terms of vegetation,

in terms of fauna. So it is not that it kept saying that it is environmentally sensitive, it is not saying that.

MS. ADAMS: Well, not just in terms of that area of development. But it talked about the wider Long Mountain range.

MRS. BROWN-SMITH: Well, actually, we had to deal specifically with the site that we were asked to look at.

MS. ADAMS: All right. Okay.

One of the justifications that the report listed for developing this site, and it listed four and one of them, if you could explain it to me, says,

“A justification for the development of the site is that the development would breach the Development Order Guidelines.”

How is that a justification for developing the site, that it would breach the Development Order Guidelines?

MRS. BROWN-SMITH: Will you complete the sentence? That’s the whole sentence?

MS. ADAMS: *“...But these can be addressed in the tradeoffs mentioned in number 3.”* I just don’t understand. How is that a justification?

MRS. BROWN-SMITH: That is why I mentioned the tradeoff. It’s a breach but if the tradeoffs can be considered, these are the ones I propose.

MS. ADAMS: But you are saying it’s a justification, that’s what I’m questioning.

MRS. BROWN-SMITH: Justification in terms of if...

MS. ADAMS: Page 33, look at it.

MRS. BROWN-SMITH: What the EIA did was to assume that there are grounds for tradeoffs.

MRS. McCAULAY: The EIA shouldn't have a justification at all. You shouldn't be making a case for the developers.

MRS. BROWN-SMITH: We actually pointed out the ...

MRS. McCAULAY: She's correct. You had a heading, *justification for site*, and then it says, "...*the development breach the Development Order Guidelines...*" and then you proceed to make the case that it can be addressed by tradeoffs.

MRS. BROWN-SMITH: We did not make any indication. We presented everything on the table.

MRS. McCAULAY: Mrs. Brown-Smith, you were making a case in that statement.

MRS. BROWN-SMITH: We were not making a case.

MRS. McCAULAY: Yes, it did.

MRS. BROWN-SMITH: We were just presenting it as it is.

MRS. McCAULAY: And really, the role of the EIA is to present the environmental list, to suggest the mitigation measures that could be carried out. But there are several places in the document where you make the case for the developer and this is not something that is unusual, but it is something that should stop.

MRS. BROWN-SMITH: You could also say we should not indicate mitigation measures, because that is also justification...

MRS. McCAULAY: Mitigation measures are not justification.

MRS. BROWN-SMITH: It's not the same thing?

MRS. McCAULAY: No, they are not the same thing. They are not the same thing.

On the question of the environment, I just want to read a quote from your library, it says,

“Removal of the current forest will completely modify the fauna of the area. The dominant fauna group, the birds will be among those species most significantly affected. Approximately fifty per cent (50%) of the property birds are forest dependent, as such, the development will produce a change in the avian community from one dominated by forest dependent species composed of many endemic species and sub-species to a community composed of a few species, almost totally of non-endemic birds.”

So there are environmental considerations and it is very hard being a veteran of these meetings, it's very hard. I notice that many people stood up and said they are in favour of housing too. I am in favour of the housing too, but I really think when we have gone to the trouble of planning Orders, that key areas of green space that have a variety of benefits both to the environment and to public health and to the quality of our lives, we should not breach that and we particularly shouldn't breach it when it is a government agency doing the breaching.

My colleague here, you asked the question, can anybody really convince you that a decision might be taken not to go ahead. And I'm going to answer you. A decision could be taken not to go ahead. There are people in this room who have that power, but it is going to entirely depend on how much opposition they get and how organised is that opposition, and that is the truth.

A lot of people come to public meetings but then afterwards, when there is some hard work to be done, some boring stuff, everybody evaporate. So it is going to depend upon everyone who cares about this matter.

CHAIRMAN: Any other questions? All right.

MRS. COOPER SHAW: I see here that the construction activities will last for six (6) months. It's a paper tiger because I'm a part of one that should have lasted a year and it is now going ten (10) twelve (12)..

MRS. BROWN-SMITH: Actually, it's a subdivision.

MRS. COOPER SHAW: Persons are going to build their houses on the availability of their funds. So for me that it be posthumously before...

MRS. BROWN-SMITH: That's the nature of subdivisions, unfortunately.

CHAIRMAN: Any other comments?

MS. ANDRADE: Danielle Andrade, Jamaica Environment Trust.

I noticed in your presentation that you had shown some letters from some government agencies and there is a letter from WRA in July, 2011, I think, one from ODPEM, and there is one setting out

what they propose or recommend to be some measure that should be implemented to prevent flooding, or mitigate, or to deal with the drainage issue.

I see that obviously some of these letters came in after the EIA was presented, but I'm a bit concerned having heard from some of the residents that drainage is an issue, flooding is an issue in the area, that there won't be a comprehensive proper drainage plan that the agencies can consider, that the public can look at before approval is granted.

I have seen permits that approve development subject to a drainage plan being submitted. And I've seen where people don't submit drainage plan. I don't know what happened with that drainage plan. The permit said a drainage plan must be submitted. People were flooded out. So, I would really love to see if there could be some kind of comprehensive drainage plan looking at some of these recommendations before any kind of permit is approved.

I don't know if this is something that NEPA or anyone could address.

MRS. BROWN-SMITH: In response to your question, you had asked about a comprehensive drainage plan. The EIA process would not be responsible. That could be recommended and the agency, the responsible agency is supposed to have a look. So I think you

probably will have to direct your concerns to the responsible agency.

MS. ANDRADE: Okay, I suppose that would be NEPA. Well, NEPA is the one granting the permit and the other agencies cannot approve the development unless NEPA gives its consent in writing or approve it first. Hopefully, one will be done that will be comprehensive, that will deal with these concerns.

I think a lot of concerns that I had were raised by other people. The only question I have and you may have said this before earlier on, but I didn't hear. The development is called Mona Section I and I wondered if there is a Section II?

MRS. BROWN-SMITH: No.

MS. ANDRADE: No Section II, no Section III?

MRS. BROWN-SMITH: No, no.

MS. ANDRADE: No Phase II?

MRS. BROWN-SMITH: Listen, we said before that the project proponents hold over two hundred (200) acres. There was an original proposal to develop the entire area but given the concerns expressed by the citizens and of course, concerns by the authorized regulatory agencies, that was shelved. So the name has been maintained. It should be changed because it does give the impression that there was a Section II.

MS. ADAMS: How can you say that? You are not the owner. HAJ is the owner. You can't say that.

MRS. BROWN-SMITH: Information supplied to us, because we have to enquire.

MS. ADAMS: You could say whatever, HAJ is the owner.

CHAIRMAN: Is there anybody here from Mona Heights who can speak about issues, because we have not heard from Mona Heights.

MR. WILLOUGHBY: Mrs. McCaulay, I thank you for responding about the fact that there are people in this room who can make the decision to do the right thing. I am going to hope that they are going to do the right thing because these people have no care and concern for how much they are disrupting people's lives and for you to make a decision based on expediency and connections as we know this country runs. We are hoping this is going to stop and I'll tell you, Mrs. McCaulay, I'm willing to fight the fire. Do the right thing.

MS. ANDRADE: I'm from Mona.

CHAIRMAN: You're the person from Mona? Are you representing Mona too?

MS. ANDRADE: I was representing a concerned citizen of Jamaica. I'm from the Jamaica Environmental Trust as well.

CHAIRMAN: Anybody can speak about Mona Heights' concerns?

MS ANDRADE: I can say we share the same concerns about traffic, especially during peak hours so that traffic is a concern. Not being as close to that proposed site as Beverly Hills, Long Mountain and Pines of Karachi, we don't share the same concerns about drainage and so on. I think we are not directly impacted by that.

I understand that the water supply – the capacity of the Mona Reservoir is adequate to supply the site. That is what I am hearing anyway that tanks will be provided. Water supply is an issue. Those are the concerns.

CHAIRMAN: Just for the record, Mona Heights Citizens Association Cooperative was invited to this meeting, but thank you for that comment.

Faval.

MS. ADAMS: I want to come back on this ten (10) acres because I just heard Mrs. Brown-Smith said there is no Section II, but let me point out, I'm going to go to this chart, here that they are talking about recreation, this part, all up here is Section II, III and IV, so it's in it already. So how could you stand up here with a straight face and say that there won't be a Section II? It's there already.

MRS. BROWN-SMITH: This proposal is Section I, not Section II.

MS. ADAMS: How do we get this area here, all of this off the table? How do we get this off the table? How do we get this out of the hands of the HAJ? How do we preserve this?

MR. BROWN: Let me just address your concern.

We have some physical boundaries on the site, which we should really pay some attention to. We have some physical boundaries. Boundary number 1 is this roadway here. If you want to pick a boundary, all the development in that area, Beverly Hills, Karachi,

et cetera, this will be an ideal place for that boundary, that road. The other physical boundary we have is this drain/gully, whatever we call it, going down here, which is just off that roadway. So there is no hope in anyone's mind of having a Section whatever else beyond this situation.

I don't know how you would be able to do this development and convince anybody now that you are not going to have effects on the reservoir.

CHAIRMAN: Barry, you finish?

MR. BROWN: Sure.

CHAIRMAN: Name and association, please.

MR. GORDON: Andre Gordon, Commissioned Land Surveyor. I can just put some closure to why it is Section I. The property is two hundred (200) acres. The road naturally subdivides the property so when you are doing a survey, once there is a road that is not a part of the property it is a reserve road. So you have to name Section I or Lot I, Lot II and in this case it was Section I.

CHAIRMAN: Okay, but you didn't answer Faval's question. Here across the road, so is this still Section I?

MR. GORDON: No, that would have been part of the remainder of the land. However, as I said, I can just settle the issue of why it is Section I. The other issues are up for discussion.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you for that, Andre.

Barry.

MR. BROWN:

One of the things we have to again consider, the main recreation area we have for walking in all of this area is the Mona Dam, which is... they are putting more and more pressure on the dam by the number of people so we need recreation areas outside of the Mona Dam.

We have a little one inside Mona itself which is getting too crowded. This is an ideal area for such a recreational area, if it is just to walk.

CHAIRMAN:

I want to ask a question. It goes back to what Diana said earlier about Central Park, Hyde Park and Savannah. Diana, would you call Central Park, Hyde Park and Savannah, they are green spaces, but would you call them natural?

MRS. McCAULAY:

No, it isn't but they are not covered in houses, so you see the comment about degraded forest, a lot of Jamaican forest is degraded. It can recover, but not when covered with houses. So you are taking an irreversible condition to take an area that could be better than it is in green spaces and turn it permanently into concrete.

CHAIRMAN:

So my question about the recreation area across the road here to satisfy a green space requirement, you are going to clear land and so what, let's just target Faval's question...

MRS. BROWN-SMITH:

Yes, this property line here.

CHAIRMAN: So this is going to be a green space but not left in its existing state, is that correct?

MRS. BROWN-SMITH: It's going to be landscaped for active - and it's not just active space for the proposed development, but for other residents of the area who may choose to use it.

CHAIRMAN: Sorry. Mr. Thompson has a question again.

MR. THOMPSON: I just wanted to add also, some of the issues that were not covered extensively in the EIA. There was very little or no mention of the impact of the new development on the reservoir itself. In terms of the physical reservoir, the water quality, there was just not ...

CHAIRMAN: Just a one word answer.

MR. BROWN: There is no impact whatsoever from this development on the Mona Reservoir.

CHAIRMAN: And that was covered in the EIA.
We have several people talking a few times. Anybody else want to add something to this discussion? Anybody else who has already spoken wants to talk some more?

MR. BURCHISON: Rez Burcheson, I live in Long Mountain.
One point was raised when the presenter was going through by stating that the traffic is going to be directed on to the existing Long Mountain Road, but isn't that a bit flawed? Because I would suspect that any resident of the proposed community can decide which road to use, Long Mountain or the Beverly Hills Road.

And you spoke about mitigation in your presentation. Any suggestions on if that is a problem, well what's the possible solution?

MRS. BROWN-SMITH: Well, I was directed by the developer that the access road for the site is the Long Mountain Road.

MR. BURCHISON: But that's obviously flawed. It's flawed because the residents - really now we can't dictate which road a person uses because it's a public road and we are all aware of that. And I'm quite sure Faval can speak to it because she has an issue with it, that the existing Beverly Hills Road, and maybe even what Paul raised about the existing Long Mountain Road really, it can't handle the capacity. So I think we may want to relook at that statement and certainly revise and make some suggestions about mitigation. That's definitely off the table today.

MEMBER: Did anybody look at the impact of the dissipating manhole for the reservoir in the event of a crack of an earthquake.

MR. BROWN: If it's an energy dissipating manhole, meaning the pump to that manhole kills the energy from the force of the fluid going in. It drops to the ground and flows by gravity. That is why it concerns me now that you are having smells coming from that manhole. So it should be looked at.

MS. HAUGHTON: M. Haughton, Pines of Karachi.

What I found surprising, your comment earlier when Mrs. Cooper Shaw mentioned the dissipating manhole for this location, was that you said that wasn't part of the consideration when you were doing your studies because you haven't heard of it.

NWC has, from they were NHDC, a file of documents that we have been having serious problems with this dissipating manhole from the inception. Particularly since the Long Mountain development was put in place. So I find it very strange that if you're doing a study, you're the consultants doing the study that that was not part of the consideration for your study.

MR. BROWN: It was not part of the consideration, but the information I had is different from what I'm being told.

CHAIRMAN: So, who is right?

MR. BROWN: I have been told that when they did some work on the pump station further down the road that problem was alleviated. If it is, it is not corrected.

MS COOPER: So since you didn't know of that one, is a new one you're going to erect for this housing scheme?

MR. BROWN: New what?

MS COOPER: Dissipating manhole.

MR. BROWN: No, no.

MRS. COOPER SHAW: But if you didn't know about it how are you going to put something there?

MR. BROWN: No, you don't understand what I'm saying. There is a facility that is supposed to perform in a particular way. We have investigated it and they say it works in a particular way.

MRS. COOPER SHAW: It works in a particular way.

MR. BROWN: If you're now telling me that it is not the case, this is the place to say it and we will follow up further from here. This is not the end of it.

MRS. COOPER SHAW: So I'm going to reiterate, it is an affront to the community and to think that you were going to add to it is an affront squared.

MR. BROWN: No, you should not approach this particular...

MRS. COOPER SHAW: It is so stink that I am passionate about it.

MR. BROWN: Yes, I know you passionate but don't approach it this way. Tell us specifically and we will address it.

MRS. COOPER SHAW: And to make the mater worse, we are having the same problem from Mona Great House. So we are surrounded. We are a fecal community.

CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions?

We can begin wrapping up now?

MR. BROWN: Could I ask something specific of you? Just one quick question, you were mentioning something about flooding in the area. Can you just give me an idea where that happens?

MRS. COOPER SHAW: Well, it happens from different areas. Coming from Karachi Avenue, it comes straight down to Mahogany Drive, straight down

to there and go to the right on Pine Boulevard. Then at the top of Pine Boulevard there is a drain that we have asked the Minister of Local Government to send a team to look at it for us. The drain they say is coming from Beverly Hills – this is an allegation – the back has no wall, just the front has concrete and the last heavy rains, three houses, the water just came down into three houses from up there.

MR. BROWN: Could I just ask a favour? That I just need to get a contact.

MRS. COOPER SHAW: Local Government has the information.

MR. BROWN: No, no, I need to speak with you.

MRS. COOPER SHAW: I have done so many walk throughs and if you see my age it is not compatible with this number of walk throughs, but I will do that.

MR. BROWN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Well, ladies and gentlemen, we have concluded the question and answer session. Let me just again reiterate that this is not the end. This is where the consultants will continue to canvass and take the information that you have shared.

CHAIRMAN: Ten people spoke with multiple questions being asked. We have a reporter in the room documenting everything verbatim. This will be documented and presented and submitted as well.

All of your comments have been noted, I have noted a few myself. My own enthusiasm got the better of me. I started participating more than I should have, but it is still a very important issue.

If I'm a stakeholder from UWI, then I think I just added my two cents worth.

But we shared several comments, certainly from the Pines of Karachi and Long Mountain Country Club and the Beverly Hills Citizens Association ranging from the specifics about the EIA, as well as some larger community issues surrounding drainage, sewage, et cetera. And the fact of the matter is, ladies and gentlemen, all of you guys have to live together in the end and the EIA looking specifically at the property of Mona Section I, will still redound to the neighbours up and down the road.

At this time I really want to thank you all for coming. Thank you certainly to the ten people who participated and asked tons of questions.

We had promised you we wouldn't finish at 10:00 o'clock.

There are opportunities to speak to one another afterwards. Refreshment is being served in the back, but finally I also want to note, certainly to our friends from Beverly Hills, et cetera, there are different agencies here, NWA is here, WRA is here, NEPA is here, but they have also listened to your comments and your comments have been documented as well and it is important to note that they are not just sitting here, impassive. I'm sure NWC this couldn't have been a pleasant evening for you and KSAC as well. But they

are here nonetheless. It is not as if they ignored you completely by not even coming.

So, with that I want to wish you all a good evening. Enjoy yourself and good luck.