



Airport Redevelopment Project. Scoping for Environmental and Social Impact Assessment.

The following is a summary of ESIA-related issues identified by stakeholders during consultation meetings held during the week of 1st February 2016. It must be noted that much of the focus of most of these meetings revolved around the nature of the agreement between Bermuda Government, CCC and Aecon; and the process which led to that. Primary concerns included: Access to Opportunity; Jobs for Bermudians; and; the Financial Deal and how it is structured to Protect Bermuda. Many aspects of the pressing public concerns received are outside of the remit of this ESIA (such as political, PPP, tendering process) and cannot be answered by LAS or BEC. Additionally many comments were received that were of value to design and functionality considerations, but not directly relevant to ESIA. A full record of the concerns expressed; the questions asked; and the suggestions made have been forwarded to Aecon for their responses. As a result the notes presented here relate specifically to the ESIA remit and thus do not reflect the full flavour of the conversations that we had.

The team that conducted these consultation meetings was:

Ken Hassard – Aecon (Ken provided those responses attributed to Aecon)
Pascale Méra – LAS
Anne Glasspool and Jack Ward – BEC

New Terminal Siting:

- How do we know that this is the best location for the terminal?
 - Response: Alternative locations were considered and ranked with this site being selected. The process used, and metrics applied are described in the 2006 Airport Master Plan which can be found at the following link. https://www.dropbox.com/s/p9fd2qbjbcxijs1/Bermuda%20Master%20Plan%20December%202006.pdf. This analysis has been revisited recently by the combined Bermuda Government/Aecon team (and their respective technical advisors HNTB/Mott MacDonald) and the initial conclusion was validated.
- It was suggested that the site is not suitable it is on a landfill and is subsiding.
 - Response: Geotechnical studies have been conducted and these will be used to inform the design of foundations to ensure a structurally sound solution that meets all applicable building codes.
- What happens to the stand-by runway? Don't we need to ensure that flexibility and responsibility to the safety of travellers is maintained?
 - Response: This issue was addressed in the 2006 Master Plan and it was determined that Bermuda airport is compliant with the International Civil Aviation Organisation (ICAO) standards with one runway, and analyses of wind data indicated that a second runway is therefore not required and also not cost-effective.





- Can't we replace the old terminal in stages in the same place?
 - Response: This option was considered during the Master Planning work and rejected due to continued vulnerability of the existing terminal to storms; condition and layout of the existing facility; challenges posed by attempting to rebuild the existing facility while maintaining a functioning airport that provides adequate service levels.
- What is the current airport elevation relative to sea level, and at what base elevation will the new one be located?
 - Response: The proposed new passenger terminal will be built at a higher elevation than the existing terminal, which is approximately 3 meters above mean sea level. Wave and storm models show that the new terminal will be more protected and less vulnerable to storm surge than the existing airport.

Site Contamination:

- Concern was raised about the legacy of this ex-military base in that there are
 potential toxins in the soil that could be disturbed during earth moving construction
 activities.
 - Response: Aecon responded that Annie's Bay and Airport Finger are the known locations of bunkers which are not within the proposed new terminal area. The proposed terminal is far from those sites. However, the ESIA will include soil sampling in the area of development to determine if there are any contaminants in the soil.
- Concern was raised about the release of asbestos during demolition of existing building.
 - Response: There is asbestos in parts of the existing building and safety is a priority. Aecon understands that this is an issue of extreme sensitivity. Any future asbestos removal will be carried out by qualified professionals in strict accordance with international Control of Asbestos Regulations, including notification, medical surveillance and record keeping.

Noise:

- The main impact of the current airport is felt by St. David's Island. Property values
 are affected by noise and air pollution. Concern was also raised over the potential of
 noise impact on people living on the other side of Ferry Reach and also that there is
 the potential that the new airport will cause more noise impacts than the existing
 facility.
 - Response: Noise and air pollution are topics that will be studied during the ESIA.





Environmental Assessment Process:

- At what point does the ESIA take into account public concerns?
 - Response: It starts at the beginning. The first phase of the studies is scoping, in which consultation with the public and key stakeholders is used to determine the concerns of stakeholders. This then defines the scope of environmental and social studies required during the ESIA. Public concerns also factor into the assessment stage as impacts are characterised.
- Is the job of BEC and LAS to give an opinion?
 - Response: No, the studies are used to provide the information required for a well informed decision to be made by others.
- Will the ESIA provide consideration of whether or not the Project should go ahead?
 - Response: BEC and LAS depend on stakeholders and the community to scrutinize the process. There are checks and balances in place. The ESIA assesses impacts but does not provide an opinion on the project. It is up to the regulators to determine whether the project is in the public interest and whether or not it should be permitted.
- What criteria will cause the ESIA to find the proposal is not viable/ the ESIA to fail?
 - Response: the ESIA assesses impacts against multiple criteria, including magnitude (severity) of impact and makes a determination as to whether an impact is 'significant'. The regulator then needs to determine whether, in consideration of impacts and stakeholder input, the project is viable and in the public good (net benefit to Bermuda).
- There was concern expressed that the ESIA is not an independent process.
 - Response: It was explained that the report of the assessments will be subject to 3rd party review and will be made public with a statutory objection period.
- A question was raised about whether BEC was working towards meeting Bermudian or Canadian standards.
 - ➤ BEC and LAS are working to international standards. This is one of the reasons that social impacts are being considered. The Project also needs to be consistent with the Equator Principles to meet lender requirements.
- Will there be Financial Close before the ESIA process is concluded?
 - Response: No. Financial Close will follow ESIA completion and permitting.

Social Impacts:

What social impacts are considered in the ESIA.

LAS Int'l Consulting



- Response: The ESIA will consider the potential impact of environmental effects such as noise and dust on people; potential impacts of in-coming workforce; potential impacts on infrastructure and services and housing; and others that are identified through scoping.
- How many workers are expected to be brought in from overseas and how many would bring families.
 - Response: Aecon advises that there will be hundreds of full time workers over the projected 40 month construction period; the percentage of foreign workers is not known at this time; it is likely that only a small number of workers would come with families (e.g. Senior Project Manager). The intent is to maximize the number of Bermudian hires.
- It was noted that it would be helpful for the types of careers that will be developed to be identified and a plan developed to communicate this to the community so people can prepare to make the most of the opportunities; this can create a positive catalytic effect; need for information early to be able to plan and prepare for jobs.
 - Response: Aecon has established a working group to deal with this issue and will work with the Department of Workforce Development to ensure this is done.
- Much interest was expressed in how the terminal can function to celebrate Bermuda's culture. Collaboration was suggested with local culturally-focussed government agencies and NGOs to ensure the Bermudian "sense of place" was optimised.
 - Response: Aecon advised that they had planned a series of "sense of place" workshops and that the suggestions made would be shared with the design team.

Visual Impact:

- Concern was expressed about the fencing and buildings that will change the aesthetic value of Stone Crusher Corner.
 - Response: The potential visual impact of the proposed development will be assessed in the ESIA.
- There was a request for a design rendering of the proposed airport terminal.
 - Response: It was explained that the design was still being developed and that Aecon was meeting with three local architectural firms with the intent to engage one of them to ensure that the design was locally relevant.
- Decommissioning of the existing buildings creates an opportunity for open space/reduced massing.
 - Response: The visual impact assessment will consider both positive and negative changes.





Recreational Uses:

- Recreational lands use is the project going to affect any? Will this affect the
 existing motorsports in the area of Apron V.
 - Response: The project includes no plan to take over any recreational land. However, the potential impact of the project (during construction and operation) on the use of such recreational lands will be assessed.
- It was specifically asked whether the construction will interfere with use of Ferry Reach for power boat racing and camping, etc.?
 - Response: Aecon explained that it is not anticipated that the project would affect the use of Kindley Field Park for these various activities and that the scheduling of works can take into account the timing of Cup Match, etc., to reduce the potential of negative impacts.

Infrastructure:

- Concern was raised about Bailey Bridges (e.g. Longbird Bridge), whether they would be a challenge for the proposed project, and whether their improvement is part of the Project description.
 - Response: Aecon responded that the plan is to land supplies at Marginal Wharf. There is no provision in the Project for bridges or a causeway.
- Concern was expressed over the potential traffic impacts of construction and operations on St. David's.
 - Response: The need for a traffic impact study has been identified. This will be included as part of the ESIA.
- Can this project be used as leverage to improve management at the bulk metal waste facility?
 - Response: This may be the case but is generally outside the scope of the ESIA. The changing visual impact of the bulk metal waste facility will be assessed as it will be more visibly exposed with the removal of the old terminal.
- Will BAS/Postal facility be retained?
 - Response: Aecon is currently reviewing the status and condition of that building. A decision will be made on the basis of the results of that review.
- There is currently no boat access to the airport. Is a ferry dock being considered?
 - Response: That is not within the scope of the current project.
- Can Aecon consider joining forces with St. Georges to deal with their waste water and sewage treatment issues? St. Georges is looking at addressing their waste disposal issues and there may be value in linking projects and resources.

LAS Int'l Consulting



- Response: This is the first time this issue was raised with Aecon; They will assess the potential of this opportunity.
- Jetways would improve all-weather access for all. At present access for those with challenged mobility is poor and should be improved.
 - Response: The new terminal will feature enclosed jetways. Improved all-weather accessibility will rate as a positive impact in the ESIA.
- Concern that there is a lack of coordination between different projects currently being considered and that to fail to do so, raises issues of sustainability and misses the opportunity of resource sharing.
 - Response: The ESIA will assess cumulative impacts of concurrent projects.
- Foreign built buildings have a bad track record in Bermuda therefore there is concern about maintenance needs in the future.
 - Response: Aecon has experience building in similar environments and will be working with Bermudian architects familiar with local conditions and viable materials options for optimising the resiliency of the new terminal design. All proposed materials must meet Bermuda Building code standards and/or be vetted and approved by the local Materials Committee.
- Concern was expressed regarding the state of the building and fixtures that Bermuda would receive after 30 years and whether the maintenance of that asset would place an unreasonable economic burden on Bermuda.
 - Response: Aecon shared the perspective that with their experience and use of modern materials the terminal may well last up to 100 years. There will be an obligation for the Project Company to diligently maintain the airport throughout the concession period and hand it back to the government in good condition at the end of the 30 year term.
- Strong interest was expressed in the concept of an energy efficient development fuelled with renewable energy to the greatest extent practical.
 - Why is the project not incorporating wind turbines?
 - Will solar PV technology be incorporated into the design?
 - "It would be remiss of the design team to not include solar panels on the roof of the terminal".
 - Response: Aecon indicated that wind turbines would likely pose a risk to aviation safety and violate height restrictions for airport structures. A plan for implementation of a PV plant on the "finger" is being explored by the government of Bermuda. There was no plan to include solar panels on the roof of the airport but this suggestion would be passed on to the design team. Renewable energy and strategies to improve the efficiency of the planned development will be considered in the ESIA.





Health and Safety:

- Concern was expressed over construction impacts on people: what will be the effect
 of dust on airport workers and tourists in and around the terminal as well as
 passengers and systems in aircraft? How will people be protected during
 construction?
 - Response: Health and Safety will be scoped into the ESIA and mitigation and management plans developed where appropriate.
- The existing terminal is not a healthy place to work. The sewage system is inadequate making the place smell and the roofs leak promoting the growth of mould.
 - Response: The state of the facility was assessed and reported upon during the 2006 Master Planning exercise and a second assessment is currently being carried out by Aecon. This will be part of the the base-line conditions against which the potential impacts of the proposed development will be assessed.

Biosecurity:

- It was noted that currently there are inadequate facilities for quarantine functions for infected humans, and/or plants and animals.
 - Response: The ability of the proposed terminal to meet locally legislated requirements will be considered.

Biodiversity:

- Concern was expressed regarding the potential effects of night lighting on birds. In particular lighting impacts on nesting Cahows need to be managed. Experience has shown that proper hooding can control bleed out of light thereby reducing impacts on nesting islands.
 - Response: This issue will be taken forward to design team and the potential impact of the final design on nesting birds will be assessed during the ESIA.
- Concern was expressed over the potential effects of run-off into the marine environment and nearby mangrove habitats.
 - Response: It is planned that all drainage systems will be served by oil/water separators. Run-off will be assessed through the ESIA.