

16 March <b>2005</b>	<p>DoE writes to Managing Director of the NRA (Colford Scott (then-MD) and Edward Howard (current MD) copied in) saying that the EIA process should be applied:</p> <p>“This would represent an information gathering and rationalization phase during which all alternative options (including the “do nothing” option) would be objectively identified and evaluated. Larger issues like the source of aggregate for the road, storm water drainage, growth management strategies, compatibility with other national policies and plans etc. would be factored in at this stage.”</p> <p>“The DoE would caution that the gazetting of this corridor without proper evaluation has the potential to create false expectations from the perspective of landowners and developers. This east-west corridor represents a massive capital investment for the country; it is critical that proper planning and evaluation take place.”</p>
2006-2014	<p>Between 2006 and 2014, the discussions were a little more complicated because of the involvement of Eagle Assets Investments and the proposal from David Moffitt.</p> <p>In 2012, Eagle Assets Ltd stated they would be carrying out an EIA for the 400 acre masterplan. In 2014, they seemed to walk it back a little and then proposed to ‘carry out an environmental audit of some kind’.</p> <p>In the end, they received planning permission without an EIA.</p>
3 March 2014	Alden McLaughlin held a press conference where he said, “the \$40 million, 10-mile highway extension would go through a rigorous environmental impact assessment before being given the final go ahead.”
29 December 2014	Ministry of PLAHI writes to DoE asking for help with Terms of Reference
13 January 2015	DoE writes back with some help and a request for more information
	<b>1 year 3 months pass</b>
<b>28 April 2016</b>	<p>Ministry of PLAHI writes back saying they don’t want to do an EIA:</p> <p>“Having regard to your previous comments, we feel that it is necessary to again seek clarification if an EIA is actually required for the road corridor, because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There has never been an EIA for any road scheme before;</li> <li>- The EW Arterial road corridor has been published in the gazette under Sect 26 of the Roads Law since May ’05 (denoting a long-term intention for a public road), and is therefore recognized in the</li> </ul>

	<p>Development Plan for 11 yrs now;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- FFR is unclear if one is necessary (for certain types of projects such as roads);</li> <li>- Agreement was reached with the National Trust to minimize infringement on their land holdings (including around the mastic trail), and noting that the EW Agreement takes the road just to the east of Frank Sound to the Ironwood Development (not to the north east towards the Salinas)".</li> </ul>
2 May 2016	DoE respond saying an EIA is required.
29 June 2016	EIA Directive is gazetted.
20 September 2016	Ministry of PLAHI again write to say they don't want to do an EIA. The memo sent in April 2016 is elaborated on.
26 Sept – 28 October 2016	Various pieces of correspondence notifying Ministry PLAHI that NCC will be considering their Memo in the form of a Screening Opinion.
12 October 2016	NCC issues the EIA Screening Opinion.
28 October 2016	DoE write to say that NCC has considered their Memo of 20 Sept 2016 against a Screening opinion prepared by the DoE and confirms EIA will be required. Also say that they Ministry has 28 days to respond or the application is considered withdrawn.
8 February 2017	NCC writes to say that as they have not heard a response, the application is considered withdrawn.
15 March 2017	Ministry of PLAHI writes to say that they now do wish to do the EIA.
4 April 2017	DoE writes to request information including a plan to prepare the EIA Scoping Opinion.
	<b>1 year 5 months pass</b>
<b>24 September <u>2019</u></b>	<p>Ministry of CPI write to say they don't want to do an EIA for Phase 2 (Hirst Road to Lookout Gardens)</p> <p>"While we do not wish to undertake an EIA for this section, we wish to be as sensitive/cognizant of environmental concerns for the area."</p>
7 October 2019	NCC considers the request and decides that an EIA should still be undertaken for Woodland Drive east.
22 October 2019	Ministry of CPI says they will do the EIA from Woodland Drive to Harvey Stephenson Connector.
19 November 2019	An EIA Scoping Opinion is provided for this section as requested

	(not to Frank Sound Road)
	<b>6 months pass</b>
22 May 2020	NRA reaches out with an early draft of the RFP.
3 June 2020	DoE provides feedback
11 August 2020	NRA provides a second draft for the RFP.
17 August 2020	A meeting is held with T.Y. Lin and NRA to discuss RFP.
2 October 2020	<p>Ministry of CPI again reaches out because they do not want to do the EIA. The idea that an EIA can be conducted while a development is under construction is completely nonsensical.</p> <p>“We’d like to meet w/ you and your team with regard to the above. Early indications note that the study will be very expensive and take quite some time. The proposal/idea is really to see if there’s any flexibility in doing it simultaneously, as the purpose of the study is to mitigate any issues/build the road “properly” to deal with flooding/water movement. To do such a study, we’ll need to get in there and investigate as well, so it would seem plausible? We are not advocating a clear swath strategy but a sensitive, cautious approach.”</p> <p>They request a meeting.</p>
7 October 2020	EAB tries to schedule a meeting, chasing on 7 October, again on the 9 October, again on the 13 October, finally cancelling the meeting after a second chase on 13 October after no reply is received.
1 December 2020	<p>Mark Scotland now calls saying again that they do not want to do the EIA.</p> <p>“As we discussed, NRA would like to consider the option, if it is possible, to carry out a simultaneous process of preparing the EIA while gazetting, planning, designing and commencing the construction of the extension of the East-West Arterial to Lookout Gardens. This would allow for an earlier completion of the much needed road extension project to relieve congestion and improve safety, while ensuring that all likely the environmental effects that were identified in the EAB Scoping opinion would be addressed as a priority.”</p>
15 December 2020	The EAB tries to schedule a meeting to discuss the above and proposes early January but the NRA say they are not ready until late January. They do not propose a new time in January.

	<b>9 months pass</b>
8 September 2021	DoE presents to the NRA Board on this and two other major projects.
8 October 2021	The NRA presents to Caucus with DoE invited to attend
9 October 2021	NRA provides a timeline and requests an EIA Scoping Opinion for Woodland Drive to Frank Sound.
5 November 2021	An EIA Scoping Opinion is submitted for Woodland Drive to Frank Sound.
November to February 2022	TY Lin have some questions about methodology for the RFP. There is some back and forth and a meeting held on the timeline.
4 March 2022	RPF for EIA Services is issued
9 March 2022	The EAB suggests that the EAB and the NRA both evaluate C3, with the results averaged. We will be able to advise whether the timing is unrealistically long or short, whether the delivery approach is likely to be successful, whether they correctly understand the key issues raised in the EIA Scoping Opinion, whether the EIA assumptions are reasonable etc.
11 March 2022	<p>The NRA says that help is not necessary.</p> <p>“The requirement of the EIA, the procurement of an consultancy firm to execute the EIA (subject to EAB review of the TOR for the EIA and instructions/directives), is the sole purview of the NRA.”</p> <p>“The members of the Advisory Team to the NRA that will be assist in the review of the proposals received for the EIA of the East-West Arterial project procurement have significant experience in the conduct of EIA for transportation projects over several years – the combined number of years of experience totals just under 130 years either in an oversight or advisory capacity, or as lead consultants in such projects. Therefore, the NRA is confident with the review team capabilities in assessing the proposals that will be received against the Scoping Opinion.”</p>
12 May 2022	The EAB reviews the bids and selects the ones who display sufficient competency against the EIA Scoping Opinion.
	<b>5 months pass</b>
18 October 2022	The EIA Consultants reach out to set up a meeting with the DoE
25 October 2022	DoE meet with EIA consultant and learn that NRA have requested 2 separate EIA's for two phases of the road. Both DoE and the EIA consultant agree that one EIA which considers the full road corridor would not only be cheaper and faster but it would also deliver a

	much better outcome from the EIA process.
--	---