## Appendix N – Public Comment Responses

## **Environmental Statement East-West Arterial Extension:**

Section 2 (Woodland Drive – Lookout Road) Section 3 (Lookout Road – Frank Sound Road) Appendix N.1 – Written Comments and Responses

Environmental Statement, East-West Arterial Extension – Section 2 and Section 3, Grand Cayman

The review and comment period for the Draft ES was instituted to collect questions, comments, and thoughts from the community on the studies completed for the EWA Extension Project, Sections 2 and 3. The Project Team sincerely appreciates your time, interest, and efforts in preparing and submitting your comments for this project. We have carefully and thoroughly reviewed your comments and offer the following in response.



#	Date	Public Comment	Торіс	Response
W1	17 Jan	Sir/Madam:	1. Bridges to	1. The Project Team acknowledges the suggestion
	2025	Having just read the article in the Cayman Compass regarding the	reduce	regarding the construction of elevated sections for the
		potential financial cost of building a second E-W highway, several	impacts	proposed East-West highway and understands the
		questions came to my mind, so I thought I'd lodge them with the		comparison to similar projects, such as the highway in
		DOE.		Florida.
				In considering an elevated causeway for the Cayman
		Question One: Has any serious consideration been given to a more		Islands, the Project Team conducted a cost analysis as
		non-conventional solution? For example, would it not be prudent to		part of the Value Engineering exercise that considered
		minimise the potential "reaction" of nature to such a severe		the specific conditions and resources available locally.
		Incursion and destruction of a natural, self-regulating system by		See Appendix F. IU: Value Engineering Options of the
		building elevated sections of the highway, similar to portions of the		Drait ES.
		loss impactful, it would soom. Also, additional elevation would		Unlike in Florida, where the necessary materials and
		addross the anticipated sea level rise noted in the report		skilled labor for such construction are readily available
		address the anticipated seafevernise noted in the report.		and can be cost-effectively sourced, the Cayman Islands
		Question Two: Has the government considered other possible		face unique challenges that influence the feasibility and
		solutions without prejudice? For example, wouldn't a government-		expense of similar structures.
		operated public transport system with strategically located depots		The primary factor in the cost analysis is the availability
		along the present roadway not be more effective, less costly and		of materials and skilled labor. In Florida, the resources
		less environmentally damaging than the proposal under		for building elevated bighways, including piles and steel
		consideration? We could start to make a dent in the traffic problem		slabs, are manufactured locally, and there is a skilled
		by mandating that all schools use bussing to move students to and		workforce familiar with installing these structures. This
		froreducing the number of private vehicles on the road at strategic		can help reduce the cost and logistical complexity of
		times.		such projects.
		In my opinion, it is time for more "out of the box" thinking and more		In contrast, for the Cayman Islands, most of the
		gutsy solutions to be implemented by our MPs. Nature has a way of		materials required for an elevated causeway, especially
		getting the last word in, and we may find that there is a critical		large precast structural components, would need to be
		mass of environmental systems that are absolutely necessary for		Imported. Additionally, the specialized workforce
		Cayman to remain "The Place to Be".		te be euteoureed
		Also, since it is obvious that one of the key values driving our		Furthermore, even if the materials and specialized
		decisions as a country is that of financial profit, we should give		workforce are local and available, the costs associated



#	Date	Public Comment	Topic	Response
		intense consideration as to how this value will (and could) be affected by such a major injury to our natural environmentboth terrestrial and marine.		with building an elevated structure are inherently higher than those for traditional road construction. Elevated highways require more materials and involve more complex engineering and construction processes, which may significantly increase the overall cost compared to ground-level roads.
				Using traditional construction methods with locally sourced materials and labor is more cost-effective for the current economic context. This approach not only supports local industry but also reduces the logistical and financial challenges associated with more complex construction methods.
				The Project Team has explored various options and remains committed to finding the most sustainable and cost-effective solutions for infrastructure needs.
				Roadway openings are included within the Proposed Project. See Section 6.6.7 Bridges of the Draft ES for estimated "proof of concept" roadway opening structure locations and lengths. The proposed roadway openings would help mitigate for impacts to natural hydrological flow and habitat fragmentation.
			2. Public transit policies	2. The importance of public transportation is acknowledged, in conjunction with the development of roadway infrastructure. As such, the NRA has provided accommodations for expanded public transport within the Proposed Project corridor. While the traffic issues do need to be addressed holistically, it is not the function of this EIA to provide public transportation or related policy.



#	Date	Public Comment	Topic	Response
				While implementing a robust public transportation system along the existing route is an attractive solution in theory, there are several challenges that could limit its effectiveness, including potential impacts associated with the establishment of bus depots and expanded parking facilities. Developing these facilities along the existing route could potentially involve altering or encroaching on other natural landscapes, habitats, lead to additional residential and/or business property impacts.
				Using the existing roadway for an expanded public transport system also does not adequately address the need for storm resiliency. The current route does not provide sufficient elevation or structural safeguards to withstand severe weather events, which are increasingly relevant due to climate change. Additionally, reliance on a single existing corridor does not offer the redundancy necessary to maintain connectivity in the event of incidents such as accidents or road damage. Creating alternate routes as part of the highway expansion plan enhances the ability to manage such incidents more effectively and ensures a more resilient infrastructure network.



	1		1	
W2	17 Jan 2025	<ul> <li>The EWA extension will still lead to traffic being congested around prospect/Red Bay during peak traffic in the morning.</li> <li>The \$120m investment would be better invested into public transport. Bus options that are safe for all children as well as adults to the main transport and office hubs (George Town/Cricket Square, Camana Bay and Governors Square).</li> <li>There is also the conservation issue. Plan B2 is better for the environment however they gone for B3 due to cost impacts/more direct route. Consideration should be given to the wetlands and the wildlife it supports as already so much of the islands wetlands/mangroves are being bulldozed and filled in to make way for more development.</li> <li>I therefore am opposed to the development.</li> </ul>	1. Congestion at Prospect/ Red Bay	<ol> <li>See Section 7.4.5: Travel Time for discussion on anticipated travel time improvements of the Proposed Project, including travel times via Prospect/Red Bay to George Town. The traffic modelling integrated the Proposed Project into the island-wide roadway network, confirming anticipated travel time benefits that meet the project's Critical Success Factors, while accounting for traffic congestion around Prospect/Red Bay.</li> <li>The NRA acknowledges the need to address the other traffic congestion locations on the island and is determining possible solutions to those issues outside of the EIA for the EWA Extension.</li> <li>The project is being developed by the NRA to meet the Critical Success Factors which include reducing traffic</li> </ol>
				examining both current and future needs results in more cost effective and less impactful projects. If the planning, design, and construction of the EWA Extension is delayed until the needs get even worse, then the project would cost more to construct and may also result in higher impacts.
			2. Investment in public transit	2. The importance of public transportation is acknowledged, in conjunction with the development of roadway infrastructure. As such, the NRA has provided accommodations for expanded public transport within the Proposed Project corridor. While the traffic issues do need to be addressed holistically, it is not the
1	1		1	



#	Date	Public Comment	Торіс	Response
				function of this EIA to provide public transportation or related policy.
			3. Conservation – wetlands and wildlife	3. Environmentally sensitive areas, including wetland habitats and species, were considered when determining the alignment for the corridor, along with additional objectives and criteria found in Chapter 2: Project Objectives and Key Constraints.
				See Chapter 5: Assessment of Alternatives Analysis and Appendix E – Shortlist [Alternatives] Evaluation of the Environmental Statement for chronology and selection of the Proposed Project route. The purpose of the EIA is to inform decision-makers by presenting data and analysis for their consideration. The purpose of the EIA is not to make a recommendation. The final decision was made by Cabinet and not the NRA or the EAB. Neither the NRA nor the EAB can speak to why Cabinet selected B3 other than to say that Cabinet considered B3 was in the best interest of Grand Cayman.
				See Chapter 13: Terrestrial Ecology of the Environmental Statement for discussion of potential habitat impacts of the Proposed Project and mitigation measures, including wetlands and wildlife.



W3	23 Jan 2025	The new East West Arterial Extension should be built exactly the way Arden built the first section. If you build the road 15 to 20 feet ASL that would create a "dam" across the island and the storm surge would flood the surge side of the Island. The culverts and bridges would plug up with debris so would not allow the water to pass. It is much better to allow the surge to pass over the top of the road and after two days the road will be dry again. Another problem is you will make the properties next to the road un- buildable As there would be too much fill needed. I assume the only people that think this is a good idea are the quarries that would supply the 100s of million \$ of fill. Please hire Arden to complete this project in a sensible manner.	Design criteria	The conceptual design of the East-West Arterial Extension (Sections 2 and 3) has been approached with a future-planning emphasis on resiliency as it relates to storm events to meet the anticipated challenges posed by climate change. This proactive approach is in response to the global trend towards building infrastructure that can withstand more severe weather events, reflecting best practices in modern road design and engineering. Refer to Section 6.3: Value Engineering and Future Cost Reduction Considerations of the Environmental Statement for a detailed analysis. During the initial phase of the EWA Extension project, alternatives were evaluated that considered elevations up to 15 to 20 feet above mean sea level or an average height of 10 feet above the existing ground. This evaluation aimed to explore the full range of impacts and establish a benchmark for resiliency planning against a 50-year storm event.
				Following this comprehensive analysis, the project team identified more cost-effective design options at lower elevations, ensuring the roadway remains resilient for more frequent weather events while also being feasible in terms of cost. This approach balances these factors effectively, ensuring that, despite a lower elevation, the roadway will maintain its functionality and safety under expected climatic conditions. These evaluations reflect the commitment to resiliency, sustainability, and prudent resource management, ensuring the EWA Extension serves as a robust component of the island's infrastructure for decades to come.



#	Date	Public Comment	Торіс	Response
W4	23 Jan 2025	To whom it may concern, My feedback on the draft Environmental Statement for the East West Arterial project is as follows: 1. The EWA fails to meet the project needs. The ES states, "The EWA Extension will improve traffic conditions between the eastern and western districts of Grand Cayman, will strengthen resiliency by adding a second travel route between districts, and will offer easier and more timely access to amenities in the western districts along with tourism destinations in the eastern districts. "Further, the ES claims, "The Proposed Project will improve travel times along the existing coastal road when compared with the No-Build scenario by diverting traffic onto the new corridor and reducing through traffic along the coastal road."	1. Travel time/ congestion at Tomlinson	The roadway is being designed to best minimise changes to existing flow patterns and flood levels and avoid "damming". See Section 6.6.1: Drainage Features and Section 6.6.7: Bridges, where strategies are described to minimise flooding during storm events. Additionally, a comprehensive hydrologic and hydraulic evaluation will be refined during the detailed design phase so that the localised drainage systems can be properly designed to handle flooding from smaller, more frequent storms and the road and the opening structures under the road can be designed to handle flooding from larger, more moderate storms (see Section 12.5.2 Operation Phase for more information). In addition, this evaluation will provide additional information for further mitigating flooding risks for the designated storm events. 1. Noted. See Section 7.4.5: Travel Time for discussion of anticipated travel time improvements of the Proposed Project, including travel times via Hurley's roundabout to George Town. The traffic modelling integrated the Proposed Project into the island-wide roadway network, confirming anticipated travel time benefits that meet the project's Critical Success Factors, while accounting for traffic congestion around Hurley's roundabout. The NRA acknowledges the need to address the other traffic congestion locations on the island and is determining possible solutions to those issues outside of the EIA for the EWA Extension.



#	Date	Public Comment	Topic	Response
		Despite this assertion, common sense tells us that all this road will		The project is being developed by the NRA to meet the
		do is get the residents of the eastern districts to the bottleneck at		Critical Success Factors which include reducing traffic
		the Hurley's roundabout slightly faster. And not for long. Once the		congestion as well as other identified considerations.
		road opens up huge swathes of land for development, any traffic		Projects of the scale of the EWA Extension take time to
		benefits will vanish. There is documented scientific evidence that		properly plan, develop, fund, and construct. Proactively
		new roads only result in increased traffic. The road will not improve		examining both current and future needs results in
		traffic conditions or timely access to amenities. The argument for a		more cost effective and less impactful projects. If the
		second travel route is also a fallacy. Recently, there was an accident		planning, design, and construction of the EWA
		that shut down lanes along the Spotts straight and, even with the		Extension is delayed until the needs get even worse,
		EWA and traffic being diverted via Poindexter, it took me hours to		then the project would cost more to construct and may
		get from town to Savannah. More roads = more accidents. More		also result in higher impacts.
		accidents = more traffic.		
				Shamrock Road and Bodden Town Road currently
		2. The land use planning charefte does not align with economic		provide the sole route for traffic between George
		reality.		Town/West Bay and North Side/East End. This lack of
		The "evidence" for population estimates outlined in the ES is		alternative routes means that incidents like crashes or
		Taughable. The Cayman Islands Government Should Invest its		nooding can cause roadway closures that completely
		hungh of stokeholders into a room to do guesswork. It is incredible		cut off east-west frame, reaving thousands of eastern
		built of stakeholders line a routine of yours work. It is increaling that the siting of botols and cruice shins is being used to guess at		vestern districts. To assess the resiliency of the
		nonulation growth when botals and restaurants represented just		Proposed Project the impacts of a read closure wore
		3.6% of CDP in 2022. The charatte does not match up with the		assessed at multiple locations along Shamrock Road
		reality of the industries that are actually driving our economy and		and Bodden Town Road, By 2026, it is anticipated that
		our immigration growth		approximately 4 to 12% of Grand Cayman's population
				could lose access to western districts if closures occur
		3 How are the proposed design features of the FWA supposed to		The Proposed Project will provide an alternative route
		integrate with the existing road network?		allowing uninterrupted east-west access during such
		The design features include separate lanes for public transport -		closures. See Section 7.4.4: Resiliency for further
		which is all well and good until those lanes come to an abrupt end		discussion of anticipated resiliency improvements of
		at the existing roads which do not have transport lanes, bike lanes,		the Proposed Project.
		etc. Again, meaning that all the EWA will do is get the residents of		
		the eastern districts to the bottleneck at the Hurley's roundabout		The Proposed Project will offer a safer alternative to the
		slightly faster.		existing coastal road and will likely divert a significant



#	<sup>‡</sup> Date	Public Comment	Торіс	Response
#	Date	Public Comment         4. Minimal indication of how the road design will minimise the risk that it will have a 'damming effect' on neighbouring communities. The report says that "Best Management Practices can be utilized during construction to minimize these potential impacts." There is no guarantee that these practices will be utilised. Further, the report says, "The hydrology could be restricted to the CMW north of the proposed roadway and cause inundation of the mangroves and adjacent developed areas south of the proposed roadway." There are too many coulds and cans for this report to be of any use to the people whose homes may be flooded out by this road. No consideration of the economic impact of losing the CMW to inundation is accounted for.         All in all, the EWA extension is an exercise in futility that will only serve to waste massive amounts of public funds, potentially destroy the CMW and inundate people's homes and only result in miniscule time savings.         The Government could put a portion of the funds it is prepared to spend on this road into public transport or bussing of school children and do significantly more to ease traffic, increase road safety, and protect our environment and communities.	<ul> <li>2. Planning charrette results</li> <li>3. Design at existing roadway integration</li> </ul>	Responseportion of traffic. The conceptual design includes a concrete median barrier to separate bi-directional traffic, which can reduce the risk of crashes by over 80% according to the United States Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). The new road will also have far fewer access points than the existing road, which can reduce the risk of crashes by over 40% according to FHWA. Most connections to the new road will feature roundabouts or partial access intersections, reducing traffic congestion. See Section 7.4.7: Safety for further discussion of anticipated safety improvements and Section 6.6.9: Intersections for details on proposed intersections along the corridor.2. Noted.3. The transit lanes and pedestrian facilities can be designed to "T" into the existing network of roadways and sidewalks and may be controlled by traffic signals. See Section 6.6.9.4 Multimodal Considerations for a description on the potential functioning of the transit and pedestrian facilities in relation to existing infrastructure. See Section 6.6.13: Transit Overview for description on potential transit routes as they relate to transit
				the current routes. The NRA acknowledges the need to address the other traffic congestion locations on the island and is determining possible solutions to those issues outside of the EIA for the EWA Extension.



#	Date	Public Comment	Торіс	Response
			4. Flooding	<ul> <li>4. Noted. The conceptual design of the East-West Arterial Extension (Sections 2 and 3) has been approached with a future-planning emphasis on resiliency as it relates to weather events to meet the anticipated challenges posed by climate change. This proactive approach is in response to the global trend towards building infrastructure that can withstand more severe weather events, reflecting best practices in modern road design and engineering. The roadway is being designed to best minimise changes to existing flow patterns and flood levels and avoid "damming".</li> <li>The Draft Environmental Statement is based on conceptual design and more refinement will be carried out during the detailed design phase (outside of the EIA). The forthcoming Environmental Management Plan is being prepared to guide implementation of mitigation measures. In addition, hydrologic and hydraulic evaluations will be refined during the detailed design phase so that the localised drainage systems can be properly designed to handle flooding from smaller, more frequent storms and the road and the opening structures under the road can be designed to handle flooding from larger, more extreme storms (see Section 12.5.2.</li> </ul>
W5	24 Jan 2025	Good Morning, I am [name redacted]. I spoke at the Northward Side meeting on Tuesday evening, January 21, 2025 and even though Tammi said my comments were captured and noted, I want to make it clear that I do not agree with, did not approve of, and will not allow the East west acterial read to pass through my property [passed information]	Alignment location/ farmland impacts	An assessment of alternatives was completed as part of the EIA and found in Chapter 5: Assessment of Alternatives Analysis of the Environmental Statement which resulted in refinements to the previously Gazetted corridor. The Project Alignment deviates from the Section 25 gazette alignment due to the analysis undertaken for this EIA based on the identified CSE
		redacted] and destrov my cow pasture and orchard of fruit trees on		



#	Date	Public Comment	Торіс	Response
#		<ul> <li>my farm in Frank Sound, so I recommend that you move that road back to its originally gazetted corridor to the north. From I was a child, we raised cattle on one of the two parcels you have diverted the proposed road through and we have raised cattle on the second piece along with the farm of mature fruit trees, for more than a decade now since we acquired it.</li> <li>I also want to point out that you moved the proposed road south out of the original gazetted corridor where it had no impact on any farm or housing development at the behest of the National Trust (and perhaps others), and placed it through my farm, a housing development that is before the Planning Department as well as Tony Powell's bus park and the Frank Sound Fire Department, but I was never given an opportunity to have my say, despite several appeals and emails that I made to Edward and Denis at the NRA and that is more than enough for me to show that the process was unfair.</li> <li>So I ask you to take me seriously when I say that the road is not going to pass through my property and I ask that you revert back to its originally gazetted corridor.</li> </ul>		Terms of References and other environmental resource factors. The EIA was developed based on the EAB Scoping Opinion and Terms of Reference (ToR). The development of the ToR included conducting 2 public meetings where stakeholders and members of the public provided comments that were used to further refine the ToR. Farmlands were not specifically identified as an anticipated impact for evaluation within the EIA when either the Scoping Opinion was finalized in November 2021 or when the ToR was finalized in April 2023. EIAs utilise either existing data or the consultants are required to produce new baseline data sets, if warranted. The agricultural or farmland in Cayman has not been identified and mapped by the Department of Agriculture; and therefore, there is no official data set to use in the analyses carried out in the EIA. Agricultural land also has no identified protection under the current Cayman Development Plan, Planning legislation or any other legislation. Under s.21 of the Development & Planning Regulations land which is zoned Agricultural/Residential has restricted density, particularly where it is either situated over a water lens or is considered suitable for agriculture. The subject parcels are currently zoned Low-Density Residential.



#	Date	Public Comment	Торіс	Response
		Old M Northside Freshwater Lens Mastic Reserve B1 B1/B3 Breakers B4/C1 FRANK S		
		Thank you and best regards		
W6	24 Jan 2025	Good afternoon, I hope this email finds you well.	1.Cost	1. Additional information regarding cost saving options has been included within Section 6.3: Value Engineering and Future Cost Reduction Considerations of the Environmental Statement.
		As a Caymanian BSc Earth & Environmental Science student, I appreciate the efforts to protect the environment in relation to the East-West Arterial extension. As someone who has lived in the eastern districts for part of my life and still have family who reside there, I would like the government to choose a cheaper & quicker option to be implemented. The road needs to be built as soon as possible for the people of the eastern districts to be able to have an additional route for emergency	2.Farmland impacts	2. Noted. The EIA was developed based on the EAB Scoping Opinion and Terms of Reference (ToR). The development of the ToR included conducting 2 public meetings where stakeholders and members of the public provided comments that were used to further refine the ToR. Farmlands were not specifically identified as an anticipated impact for evaluation within the EIA when either the Scoping Opinion was finalized in November 2021 or when the ToR was finalized in April 2023.



#	Date	Public Comment	Торіс	Response
		services and to reduce their travel time. This additional route will also increase their quality of life. I have listened to both of the public consultation meetings online. I would like the government to choose an option that doesn't go through important farmland as our food security in the Cayman Islands needs to be increased. Thank you for considering my input above. Kind regards,		EIAs utilise either existing data or the consultants are required to produce new baseline data sets, if warranted. The agricultural or farmland in Cayman has not been identified and mapped by the Department of Agriculture; and therefore, there is no official data set to use in the analyses carried out in the EIA. Agricultural land also has no identified protection under the current Cayman Development Plan, Planning legislation or any other legislation. Under s.21 of the Development & Planning Regulations land which is zoned Agricultural/Residential has restricted density, particularly where it is either situated over a water lens or is considered suitable for agriculture.
W7	24 Jan 2025	<ul> <li>Good day,</li> <li>I would like to preface this comment submission that it is being done from a personal capacity and does not reflect my employer or any organization to which I am a member.</li> <li>In review of the draft Environmental Statement produced as a part of the Environmental Impact Assessment process for the East-West Arterial proposed project, I noted that there appears to be an error in assumptions made regarding the 22.234MWdc solar photovoltaic (PV) canopy.</li> <li>Per the project documents, the proposed solar PV canopy is to be built in the year 2045 and reach operational status in 2046. Thereafter, it is posited that this PV array will contribute a positive benefit in real costs, and in greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions</li> </ul>	CBA Solar Array Assumptions	Noted. The solar array is an optional feature of the corridor and outside the ambit of the NRA to implement. Therefore, while the solar array is accounted for in the CBA, it is an option for a future investor and will not be within the NRA's construction cost. Chapter 16 – Cost-Benefit Analysis of the Environmental Statement provides CBA values both with and without the solar array. The April 2024 published National Energy Policy was reviewed and discussed with the project Steering Committee for implications to the GHG emission evaluations. Based on a lack of policies/actions to implement the targets of the NEP at the time of drafting this



#	Date	Public Comment	Торіс	Response
		reductions by displacing electricity in Grand Cayman that would otherwise have been generated via fossil fuels (namely diesel). In review of the Cost-Benefit Analysis prepared by EPB, the solar PV canopy (including 11MW, 44MWh backup battery) would provide a net societal benefit of \$162.482M (2023 USD) over its 30-year operating period, and reduce CO2 emissions by 566,644 metric tons.		Environmental Statement, conservative assumptions were undertaken. A re-evaluation of the solar array and benefits could occur by the implementing agency prior to design/ construction, if deemed necessary.
		This report and cost-benefit analysis does not appear to account for the current National Energy Policy (2024-2045), which has a target of 100% renewable energy penetration by 2045 (and a reduction of GHG emissions in the electricity sector to 0% of 2019 emissions levels by the same year). It seemed to only rely upon the 2017 Integrated Resource Plan, produced by CUC and accepted by the Utility Regulation and Competition Office (OfReg), as a basis for potential future electricity generation resources.		
		On the basis of the National Energy Policy (NEP), which was revised in April 2024, the benefits calculated for this solar PV canopy could not be realized, as there would be no fossil fuel-based electricity generation to displace. Therefore, there would not necessarily be a rate-payer cost benefit (as this proposed solar canopy would need to be compared to some other form of renewable energy generation - including alternative solar PV generators), and there would be no reduction in CO2 emissions.		
		In order for this proposed aspect of the project to provide some quantum of the calculated benefits, it would need to be constructed and operational during a period of time in which there will actually be fossil fuel-based electricity generation to displace. Per the NEP, there are interim targets of 30% renewable energy penetration by 2030 and 70% by 2037, prior to the 100% target of 2045. With a 30- year operational life, to realize the total benefits calculated in the		



#	Date	Public Comment	Торіс	Response
π		<ul> <li>EPB report, the solar canopy would have needed to become operational in 2016.</li> <li>On this basis, I would recommend that the cost-benefit analysis for the solar PV canopy (and its impact on the overall E-W Arterial project) be re-evaluated in a manner that reflects the revised NEP as an input assumption. I would presume that this might entail proposing the solar PV canopy be installed in a much earlier phase in the project, or that the net benefits are recalculated on the basis of displacing alternative forms of solar PV generation and/or other renewable energy generation technologies.</li> <li>Thank you for your consideration of this comment and I will look forward to appropriate revisions in the Environmental Statement as</li> </ul>		
		it is finalized.		
		Kind regards,		
W8	[Date not provide d]	RSPB comment on the DRAFT Environmental Statement for the Environmental Impact Assessment of the East-West Arterial (EWA) Extension from Woodland Drive to Frank Sound Road. The RSPB congratulates the Cayman Government in publishing an Environmental Impact Assessment, allowing public access to the data behind decision-making on the East-West Arterial (EWA) project. We welcome the opportunity to contribute. Summary The RSPB believes that while the EIA has collated valuable information and insights, the principal strategic failing of the analysis is in the selection of the route B3 in step 1 of the process. Regrettably, we believe this early decision in the process	1. Selection of B2	1. Noted. See Chapter 5: Assessment of Alternatives Analysis and Appendix E – Shortlist [Alternatives] Evaluation of the Environmental Statement for analysis of alternatives, comparative results, chronology and selection of the Proposed Project route. The purpose of the EIA is to inform decision-makers by presenting data and analysis for their consideration. The purpose of the EIA is not to make a recommendation. The final decision was made by Cabinet and not the NRA or the EAB. Neither the NRA nor the EAB can speak to why Cabinet selected B3 other than to say that Cabinet considered B3 was in the best interest of Grand Cayman.



#	Date	Public Comment	Topic	Response
		undermines the subsequent analysis. The data support greater	2. Parrot	2. The parrot nesting habitat data was provided by the
		environmental and social benefits of route B2. One of the principal	Habitat Data	Department of Environment and represents one of over
		species used in assessing the environmental impact of the potential		20 comparative values provided within the High-Level
		routes is the Grand Cayman Parrot. We believe that the data used		Summary Report of the EWA EIA Study Findings for the
		for this species and subsequent analysis is not reliable and a more		Selection of a Preferred Alternative memo provided to
		rigorous assessment is needed.		Cabinet. The parrot nesting data used in the assessment
				represents the most recent available data on nesting
		Route Selection and Environmental Impact		density, and was also used alongside consideration of
				habitat data and field observations.
		The EIA has identified Route B3 as the preferred option, citing its		
		alignment with long-term planning, lower greenhouse gas		The EIA is completed based on a conceptual level of
		emissions, and reduced impact on lands owned by the National		design and further refinements will occur during
		Trust. However, we strongly believe that Route B2 is a superior		detailed design, such as lighting specifications. See
		choice from an environmental perspective.		Section 6.6.11.6 Highway Lighting Placement, Section
				6.8.7: Risk Management and Contingency Plans, and
		Benefits of Route B2		Section 6.10.1: Environmental Impact Mitigation
				within the Environmental Statement for additional
		<i>i.</i> Habitat Preservation - Route B2 offers a more		information.
		favourable alignment that minimises disruption to		
		critical habitats. While Route B3 is noted for its lower	3.Alternatives	3. Noted. The High-Level Summary Report of the EWA
		impact on the National Trust lands, Route B2 avoids	Assessment	EIA Study Findings for the Selection of a Preferred
		several ecologically sensitive areas that are crucial for		Alternative memo provided to Cabinet (Appendix E,
		local biodiversity such as impacting 22.9 fewer acres of		Attachment L) includes the monetized benefits noted.
		wetland habitat.		
		<i>ii.</i> Travel time and Social Impact - Route B2 provides		Public consultation has occurred at the Draft Terms of
		better connectivity for local communities, reducing		Reference and Draft Environmental Statement stages of
		travel times and enhancing access to essential services		the EIA, as required per the EIA Directive.
		such as schools and medical services. This route also		
		has the potential to alleviate traffic congestion more		Traffic modelling and benefits were conducted through
		effectively, leading to lower overall emissions in the		future year 2074 on three different land use scenarios.
		long term.		The potential for secondary/induced development
		iii. Construction Feasibility- Although Route B3 is		within the Study Area was evaluated within Appendix L
		considered more favourable for construction, Route B2		– Land Use Development Propensity Forecasting



#	Date	Public Comment	Торіс	Response
		presents fewer challenges related to land acquisition		Technical Memo and results summarized in Section
		and displacement of local communities. This makes it a		15.3 Secondary/Induced Impacts of the Environmental
		more socially responsible choice.		Statement.
		<i>iv.</i> Lower cost- B2 is also predicted to have \$3.8 million		
		USD lower total construction and maintenance costs		See Chapter 5: Assessment of Alternatives Analysis
		because it is a shorter and more direct route than B3.		and Appendix E – Shortlist [Alternatives] Evaluation of
				the Environmental Statement for chronology and
				selection of the Proposed Project route. The purpose of
				the EIA is to inform decision-makers by presenting data
		Reliability of Parrot Habitat Data		and analysis for their consideration. The detailed
				assessment of a range of alternatives is not a
		One of the critical data sets influencing the route selection, in		requirement of the NCA, although a high-level
		opposition to the recommended route of the Environmental		assessment was done in this case. The elements under
		Assessment Board, is the impact on the amount of habitat of the		43.2 of the NCA were conducted on the Proposed
		threatened Grand Cayman Parrot. The EIA uses limited data to		Project route. The purpose of the EIA is not to make a
		suggest that Route B3 has a lower impact on the parrot habitat		recommendation. The final decision was made by
		compared to Route B2. However, given the critical reliance on this		Cabinet and not the NRA or the EAB. Neither the NRA
		data for this fundamental decision, we believe the data is		nor the EAB can speak to why Cabinet selected B3 other
		Insufficient to be able to draw such a conclusion.		than to say that Cabinet considered B3 was in the best
		i Data Callestian Mathada. The methods used to callest		interest of Grand Cayman.
		1. Data collection Methods - The methods used to collect data an the narrat nanulation and their hebitat are not		The reading is being decigned to best minimice
		uata on the part of population and their habitat are not		the roduway is being designed to best minimise
		sufficiently robust. There are inconsistencies in the data		changes to existing now patterns and nood levels and
		that account for soasonal variations in parrot activity		the installation of cross drainage stormwater pipes
		Crand Cayman Parrot data is 10 years old (from a 2014		hopoath the readway specifically engineered to
		study) Also there will be added long term impacts of		officiently manage rainfall from less severe storms
		noise which will extend further into the partot habitat		However, it is important to acknowledge that in cases
		(this is not shown geographically in the draft $FIA$ ) as		of more severe storm events, which cause flooding in
		well as light nollution. Mentioned throughout the report		the adjacent areas the roadway might also experience
		is the use of low impact lighting for road illumination		flooding
		however actual specifications of the lighting have not		li soonigi
		been provided. Additional to this would be the extra		



# Date	te P	ublic Com	ment	Торіс	Response
		ii.	light from vehicles at night which may also impact other sensitive species such as bats. Lighting has not been extensively assessed regarding the proposed project. Data Analysis -The analysis of the parrot habitat data is based on outdated models that do not accurately reflect the current distribution and behaviour of the parrot population. This undermines the validity of the conclusions drawn in the EIA.		Moving into the detailed design phase, the primary objective will be to design a resilient roadway that functions effectively without causing adverse impacts on the surrounding areas. This 'do no harm' approach ensures that while the road itself may experience flooding similar to adjacent land at lower elevations, it will not exacerbate flooding or negatively affect nearby areas.
	C	Concerns o i. ii. iii.	ver Alternative Assessments Comparative Analysis - The comparative analysis between Route B2 and Route B3 lacks depth. Key environmental and social factors that favour Route B2 have not been given adequate consideration. For example, B2 will provide \$11.5 million more of transportation benefits compared to B3. Stakeholder Engagement- There has been insufficient engagement with local communities and stakeholders who are directly affected by the route selection. Their insights and preferences should play a more significant role in the decision-making process. Long-Term Impacts: The long-term environmental and social impacts of Route B2 have not been fully explored. A more detailed analysis of economic impact and traffic reduction could reveal additional benefits that make Route B2 a more sustainable choice. There also has not been a full analysis of the environmental impact of secondary development for this alternative assessment process. The alternatives assessment's major flaw is its focus on direct impacts of the routes, over the likely secondary development from such a decision which	4. Alternatives analysis (Conclusion)	<ul> <li>4. The alternatives analysis is a phased approach in which a higher level of detail and evaluation is provided at each step (Longlist Evaluation, Shortlist Evaluation, Proposed Project evaluations) in evaluation of alternatives against the established Critical Success Factors. The detailed assessment of a range of alternatives is not a requirement of the NCA, although a high-level assessment was done in this case. The elements under 43.2 of the NCA were conducted on the Proposed Project route.</li> <li>If the Proposed Project route were to change significantly in the future, the EIA results would need re-evaluated.</li> </ul>



# Date	e Public Com	ment	Торіс	Response
	iv. v.	data for this to have been modelled. At risk is the Central Mangrove Wetland ecosystem and its associated carbon-rich mangroves which provide storm surge protection. The wetland is crucial for filtering water flowing into the North Sound, providing nutrients that support a complex food chain from turtle grass to reef species, typically species such as snappers. The North Sound's ecosystem is tightly linked to the Central Mangroves and would collapse if the wetland were destroyed. There are additional strategic level risks to Mastic Forest habitat and its associated species such the Grand Cayman Parrot. The Environmental Assessment Board recommended Alternative B2 due to its lower overall quantitative impact on natural resources, in particular protected areas and conservation areas under the National Conservation Act compared to the other Build alternatives (B1 and B3). This should not be ignored unless there are significant constraints which would make this option unfeasible, this does not include cost. The EIA concludes no impact on the North Sound if the Optimal Option with extensive bridges is used. However, if the cheaper Less Optimal Option is likely to be chosen, there would be potential impacts to North Sound. More assessments are needed to understand the impacts of the Less Optimal Option on route B2 and B3, including hydrology, flooding, water lenses, and other ecosystems.		
	Conclusion			
	In conclusion there are ci	on, while the EIA for the EWA provides valuable insights, ritical areas where the analysis needs to be revisited.		



#	<sup>#</sup> Date	Public Comment	Topic	Response
		Route B2 offers significant environmental and social benefits that have not been adequately recognised. Additionally, the reliability of the parrot habitat data is questionable, and a more rigorous assessment is needed.		
		Under section 43.2 of the National Conservation Act, it states that an EIA shall (a) assess the proposed action having regard to its direct, indirect and cumulative impact and the need to- (i) protect and improve public health and social and living conditions; (ii) preserve natural resources, ecological functions and biological diversity; (iii) protect and conserve protected areas and conservation areas; (iv) protect and conserve protected, endemic and migratory species and their habitats.		
		We believe that step 1 of the process, the alternatives assessment does not fulfil these requirements adequately which has resulted in the selection of route B3.		
		We urge the authorities to reconsider the route selection and ensure that the final decision is based on the most accurate and comprehensive information available. By addressing these concerns, we can ensure that the EWA project not only meets its infrastructure goals but also upholds the highest standards of environmental stewardship and social responsibility.		
١	V9 [Date not provide d]	Sustainable Cayman Comment on the Draft Environmental Statement for the Environmental Impact Assessment of the East- West Arterial (EWA) Extension from Woodland Drive to Frank Sound Road Executive Summary	1.Selection of B2	1. See Chapter 5: Assessment of Alternatives Analysis and Appendix E – Shortlist [Alternatives] Evaluation of the Environmental Statement for chronology and selection of the Proposed Project route. The purpose of the EIA is to inform decision-makers by presenting data and analysis for their consideration. The purpose of the EIA is not to make a recommendation. The final
		Sustainable Cayman believes that the proposed East-West Arterial (EWA) extension presents significant risks to both the environment		decision was made by Cabinet and not the NRA or the EAB. Neither the NRA nor the EAB can speak to why



#	Date	Public Comment	Торіс	Response
		and the public. While we acknowledge the need for improved		Cabinet selected B3 other than to say that Cabinet
		infrastructure, we strongly recommend selecting Route B2 over		considered B3 was in the best interest of Grand
		Route B3, as it offers a better balance of economic, environmental,		Cayman.
		and social benefits. This feedback outlines our concerns and offers		
		key recommendations for ensuring that future development is both		CIG (and more specifically the Ministry responsible for
		sustainable and in the best interests of the Cayman Islands.		Roads) will have had a chance to review all comments
				received for the EWA Extension ES document – the
		Sustainable Cayman acknowledges the necessity of an alternative		opportunity will then exist for CIG to seek (if it desires)
		roadway to the eastern districts as one of the necessary elements to		an alteration of the corridor alignment and have to NRA
		reduce the significant hardships faced by the community from		to carry out an assessment update on the impacts of
		traffic congestion. However, we must emphasize that an EWA road		the change alignment (a framework would have to be
		in isolation will create very little if any tangible relief, and it must be		developed for such future assessment). Such change to
		developed in conjunction with a modern public transit system,		the alignment would be incorporated in the detailed
		other pragmatic solutions to reduce the number of vehicles on our		design stage (outside of the EIA).
		roads and resolutions for the key bottlenecks in George Town.		
			2.Relieving	2. The importance of public transportation is
		Sustainable Cayman remains dedicated to protecting the Cayman	traffic	acknowledged, in conjunction with the development of
		Islands' natural heritage for the collective wellbeing of present and	congestion	roadway infrastructure. As such, the NRA has provided
		future generations. The Central Mangrove Wetlands, often	and	accommodations for expanded public transport within
		described as the 'ecological heart' of Grand Cayman, are the largest	investment in	the Proposed Project corridor. While the traffic issues
		remaining intact mangrove wetland in the caribbean. The		do need to be addressed noiistically, it is not the
		proposed EVVA roadway and the developments that could branch	transport	function of this EIA to provide public transportation or
				related policy.
		goal of improving socioeconomic wenare for Caymanians. The free	2 Dorrot	2. The period pasting hebitat data was provided by the
		services that this integrated ecosystem provides noou mitigation,	3.PdiTUL	5. The part of Environment and represents and of over
		storm protection, carbon storage, water and sediment initiation and	hesting	20 comparative values provided within the High Level
		literally priceless to our country. If the process of implementing an	Habitat uata	Summary Poport of the EWA EIA Study Eindings for the
		EWA road doos not acknowledge this we will suffer the		Soloction of a Droforrod Alternative memo provided to
		consequences of what we will lose. As our Islands grannle with the		Cabinet The FAB Preferred Alternative
		devastating heach erosion of Seven Mile Reach due to		Recommendation memo, which noted the EAR's
		unsustainable development practices on the western side of Grand		nreference for B2 based on the results of the Shortlist
				Evaluation (Appendix F. Attachment K), was also



-	# Date	Public Comment	Торіс	Response
		Cayman, we need to embrace this opportunity to have better foresight for the future of our people.		provided to Cabinet. The parrot nesting data used in the assessment represents the most recent available data
		Sustainable Cayman strongly recommends:		on nesting density, and was also used alongside consideration of habitat data and field observations.
		<ul> <li>A temporary pause is taken by the Government to reconsider the best route based on the EIA results and the advice of the Environmental Assessment Board (EAB), and route B2 is selected over B3.</li> <li>If route B3 is selected, despite the overwhelming evidence that B2 is the more optimal route, all land north of the EWA be protected to maintain the integrity and ecological function of the Central Mangrove Wetlands for the wellbeing of present and future generations. Government should prioritise use of the Environmental Protection Fund</li> </ul>	4.Acceptable Fit impacts (North Sound impacts)	4. The roadway is being designed to best minimise changes to existing flow patterns and flood levels and avoid "damming". To mitigate this, the design includes the installation of cross drainage stormwater pipes beneath the roadway, specifically engineered to efficiently manage rainfall from less severe storms. However, it is important to acknowledge that in cases of more severe storm events, which cause flooding in the adjacent areas, the roadway might also experience
		for the purchase of all privately owned land to the north of the road that is within the Central Mangrove Wetlands for designation as a Protected Area. Route Selection Should be Changed to B2 as Recommended by the EAB		flooding. Moving into the detailed design phase, the primary objective will be to design a resilient roadway that functions effectively without causing adverse impacts on the surrounding areas. This 'do no harm' approach ensures that while the road itself may experience
		Based on the agreed Critical Success Factors and Constraints, the Environmental Assessment Board (EAB) selected Route B2 as their preferred option because it provides: Better transportation benefits (more efficient travel times)		flooding similar to adjacent land at lower elevations, it will not exacerbate flooding or negatively affect nearby areas.
		<ul> <li>Lower overall costs (both initial construction and long-term maintenance).</li> <li>Less environmental impact (preserving critical ecosystems).</li> <li>Higher benefit-cost ratio, ensuring better return on investment.</li> </ul>	5.Secondary/ Induced development	5. The potential for secondary/induced development within the Study Area was evaluated within Appendix L – Land Use Development Propensity Forecasting Technical Memo and results summarized in Section 15.3 Secondary/Induced Impacts of the Environmental Statement.
		Route B2 clearly offers a better balance of economic growth and environmental stewardship.		



#	Date	Public Comment	Торіс	Response
		Despite this, in July 2024, the UPM government chose Route B3, citing its better alignment with the long-term infrastructure vision of the Cayman Islands. However, insufficient justification has been provided by the EIA process or by Cabinet on their selection of B3, despite the EAB strongly recommending Route B2 over Route B3.	6.Public meeting concerns	6. Recommendations for future meetings noted. The public consultation requirements per the EIA Directive were met and public meeting plans reviewed/approved by the EAB. Both meetings were facilitated by an independent moderator and utilised the Slido application to give all attendees (even those who joined virtually) an opportunity to participate.
		<ul> <li>Regarding the long-term infrastructure vision, the National Conservation Council (NCC) raised concerns with quarries, which were not addressed until after the Short-List Evaluation was completed. There should be greater transparency and disclosures with the claims of Cabinet regarding the long-term infrastructure vision. These infrastructure factors should either be evaluated fairly and comprehensively or not considered at this stage. Further, Route B3 does not eliminate conflict with quarries that already have planning permission.</li> <li>As the National Conservation Council clearly summarized in Appendix E, Attachment K – EAB Preferred Alternative Recommendation:</li> <li>The Traffic Evaluation showed that Route B2 is better than Route B3 at improving traffic.</li> <li>Route B2 will have a \$11.472 million USD greater transportation benefit than Route B3 in terms of Transportation Economic Efficiency benefits (including factors such as travel time for commuters).</li> <li>Route B2 is predicted to have \$3.782 million USD lower total construction and maintenance costs because it is a shorter and more direct route than Route P2</li> </ul>	7.Critical wetland habitat concerns	7. Noted.



#	Date	Public Comment	Торіс	Response
"		<ul> <li>Route B2 will impact the environment to a lesser extent than Route B3 across nearly all categories. In the one area of environmental impact that B3 scored higher than B2— impact on parrot nesting habitat—the completeness and reliability of the data have been questioned by the RSPB and other experts. Further, the NCC identified that double counting of the parrot habitat map with overlapping wetland habitat has resulted in potentially inaccurate relative measures of impacts on parrot habitat.</li> </ul>		
		Route B2 is predicted to have a net benefit of \$7,414,000 USD higher than Route B3, resulting in a higher benefit-cost ratio when calculated to more than one decimal place. Cabinet has inaccurately interpreted B2 and B3 as having equal benefit-cost ratios. Environmental concerns with Route B3		
		The Environmental Assessment Board raised significant concerns about Route B3, including its long-term financial and environmental costs:		
		<ul> <li>Higher Environmental Costs: Route B3 would disrupt critical habitats like the Central Mangrove Wetlands, leading to long-term damage to the island's biodiversity. It would also fragment ecosystems, putting endangered species like the Cayman parrot at greater risk.</li> <li>Increased Flood Risks: The wetland areas that would be disturbed by Route B3 play a key role in flood protection for surrounding communities. Altering this delicate ecosystem increases the risk of flooding, especially as sea levels rise due to climate change.</li> <li>Escalating Financial Burden: Route B3 is the more expensive option, both in terms of construction and</li> </ul>		



#	Date	Public Comment	Торіс	Response
		maintenance over the next 50 years, further straining public		
		finances.		
		The Government should still strongly reconsider Route B2 to avoid		
		implementing a sub-optimal solution. As Section 2 of the EWA from		
		Woodland Drive to Lookout Gardens is the same for both Poute B2		
		and B3, work can commence as planned on Section 2 in 2026 while		
		more time is taken to carefully evaluate the best option for Section		
		3.		
		Relieving Traffic Congestion		
		The summer through in the Freedom Districts are not just about		
		inconvonionco, they are a serious public health concorn. Long		
		commute times and limited access to essential services put undue		
		stress on residents, affecting their quality of life and wellbeing. A		
		coordinated effort to implement Route B2 alongside improvements		
		to public transport is critical for providing immediate relief to these		
		communities.		
		The traffic issues currently faced cannot be solved by a new road in		
		be looked at holistically and any development should be designed		
		and planned with the best interests of the people in mind. Public		
		transport options need to be implemented simultaneous to road		
		construction. A report produced by Ardent 1 in 2023 shows the need		
		for public transport and alternative options to a road to be		
		considered seriously in order to solve the issues of the zones of		
		congestion, none of the route options on their own will solve these		
		issues.		
		Argument for Financial Sustainability		



#	Date	Public Comment	Торіс	Response
		Route B3 will lead to higher costs in both construction and maintenance over the next 50 years. These additional financial burdens could have long-term implications for taxpayers. With Route B2, the Cayman Islands can achieve the same transportation goals at a fraction of the cost. This makes Route B2 not just the smarter environmental choice but also the more fiscally responsible one.		
		Reliability of Parrot Data		
		conservation organization in Europe, about the reliability of the parrot habitat data utilized in the EIA to determine that Route B3		
		inconsistencies in the data collection periods and a lack of comprehensive surveys that account for seasonal variations in		
		justification of selecting Route B3, we echo concerns that the data is insufficient to be able to draw such a conclusion. This is the only		
		category of environmental impacts that the EIA has concluded Route B3 has lower impacts than Route B2. Further, as mentioned previously, the NCC identified that double counting of the parrot		
		habitat with overlapping wetland habitat has resulted in potentially inaccurate relative measures of impacts on parrot habitat.		
		Impacts on the North Sound		
		While the EIA conclusions of no impact on the North Sound rely on the construction of the Optimal Option (with extensive bridges that		



#	Date	Public Comment	Topic	Response
		allow for minimal impact on water movement), it is most probable that the Less Optimal Option will be selected to reduce costs. If the		
		cheapest option is implemented, this could negatively impact the		
		More studies should be undertaken to fully appreciate the impacts of the Less Optimal Option for route B2 and B3 on the North Sound,		
		hydrology, flooding, water lenses, and other critical ecosystems.		
		Indirect Impacts Ignored		
		One weakness of the EIA is that it only considered direct impacts on habitats from the road footprint.		
		It is also important to take into consideration the risk of secondary		
		development if they were to be opened up by new road		
		development. This can be seen by the surrounding areas of untouched land which have potential for development, which are		
		within the vicinity of the road and therefore will be accessible in the		
		reducing the capacity of habitats to provide many important		
		ecosystem services. Research has shown that the distance to roads and fragmentation impacts the risk of future deforestation from		
		secondary development.		
		EIA Public Meetings		
		The recent public meetings on the East-West Arterial Extension		
		revealed a significant divide among the public, with a substantial portion of the O&A sessions consumed by political posturing from		
		public figures. While political representatives expressed their views,		
	1	it often detracted from the focus on addressing the concerns and		



#	Date	Public Comment	Торіс	Response
		questions of the general public. This dynamic can create a sense of disenfranchisement for community members who feel that their voices are overshadowed by political agendas. In future presentations, we recommend the following improvements to ensure a more constructive and inclusive dialogue:		
		<ul> <li>Ensure Equal Focus on Public Concerns: Future meetings should prioritize the concerns of the general public by limiting political posturing and providing equal opportunity for residents to voice their opinions. Public forums should be structured to ensure that discussions remain focused on community needs and sustainable development, rather than political agendas.</li> <li>Present Clearer Options: It is important to present all potential road options equally, including simpler, more affordable alternatives like Route B2. Presenting only the expensive options creates resistance and discourages meaningful feedback on the full range of choices.</li> <li>Clarify Cost Breakdown: Detailed cost comparisons should be provided, outlining not just the initial construction costs, but also the long-term maintenance and economic benefits of each route. This will help the public better understand the true financial implications of each option.</li> <li>Emphasize Public Transport: Incorporating public transport planning as a key component of the discussion would help address the broader transportation issues in the eastern districts. This should include clearer plans for how the road will support bus lanes or electric transport options which</li> </ul>		
		<ul> <li>can help reduce longterm congestion and make the road network more sustainable.</li> <li>Encourage Direct Public Participation: Future meetings could benefit from interactive workshops where the public can express their concerns and suggestions directly,</li> </ul>		



<ul> <li>ensuring that their voices are fully integrated into the planning process.</li> <li>Extend the public consultation period beyond the statutory minimum 21-day period and host more public meetings to allow the public more opportunities to understand the results of the EIA process.</li> <li>Transparency and Accessibility: Future consultations should</li> </ul>	
prioritize greater transparency by providing access to all relevant data upfront, including environmental impact assessments, land use studies, and updated cost projections, to allow the public a more reasonable period to review the results. This will allow for a more informed and meaningful public response.         By making these adjustments, we can ensure that future consultations are more focused on the community's needs, allowing for better decision-making and ensuring that all residents feel their voices are heard and respected in the process.         International Concern for Renowned Critical Wetland Habitat         The proposed EWA Extension has raised alarm not only locally but also from international environmental organizations. Route B3 cuts through the Central Mangrove Wetlands (CMW), which are crucial for biodiversity, climate regulation, and flood mitigation. The CMW is a Key Biodiversity Area (KBA) of international significance, it is recognized by Birdlife International as an Important Bird and Biodiversity Area (IBA) and is widely cited by scientists and conservation organisations as the largest intact mangrove wetland	



#	Date	Public Comment	Торіс	Response
		<ul> <li>Loss of Biodiversity: The wetlands support a wide range of species that could be devastated by this construction. It is essential that we protect these habitats, which serve as home to endangered species like the Cayman parrot.</li> <li>Flooding and Climate Change Risks: Wetlands are a natural buffer against flooding and disrupting them would expose local communities to greater flood risks. Moreover,</li> </ul>		
		wetlands act as carbon sinks, and their destruction would release stored carbon, exacerbating the impact of climate change. Cayman's Climate Change Policy needs to prioritize preserving these ecosystems.		
		We cannot afford to lose these critical ecosystems. It is imperative that Route B2, which avoids these valuable habitats, is chosen to protect the island's natural resources and mitigate the effects of climate change.		
		Conclusion		
		Route B2 is the more sustainable and cost-effective choice for the Cayman Islands. It travels through already degraded habitat, meaning it won't harm untouched natural areas like Route B3 would. This helps protect important ecosystems. Route B2 is also closer to existing infrastructure, meaning it connects better with roads and services that are already in place, making it easier and		
		quicker to build. For example, Route B2 can be completed faster and with lower costs because it doesn't require complex structures like Route B3, which involves elevated roads and bridges that take more time and money to build. Route B2 will help reduce long-term traffic problems, and it supports better use of public transport, which is important as the population grows. By choosing Route B2, we can avoid the risk of overdevelopment in untouched areas. This route ensures climate resilience by not disturbing vital flood-		







#	Date	Public Comment	Торіс	Response
		volunteers and professionals, the grassroots organisation looks forward to making a lasting impact in the Cayman Islands of today and for future generations. Visit sustainablecayman.org to learn more and get involved.		
W 10	2 Feb 2025	Dear Members of the Environmental Assessment Board, Opposition to the Will T Connector Road in the East-West Arterial Extension EIA – Section 2 & 3 We are writing to formally express our strong opposition to the proposed Will T Connector Road as outlined in the Draft Environmental Statement for the East-West Arterial Extension Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), specifically in Sections 2 and 3.	1.Oppose Will T	1. The Will T Connector is considered an optional future consideration, dependent on demand and available funding. If the optional Will T Connector roads that are described for the Proposed Project are implemented, it would be necessary that the new and improved roadway sections include a drainage system to control runoff and reduce negative impacts to natural drainage courses. See Section 6.1.3 Will T Connector of the Environmental Statement for further details.
		My family and I have serious concerns regarding the harmful impact this road will have on our land[parcel information redacted], particularly with respect to drainage, agricultural use and overall land integrity. Our land has been used for generations for farming, including crops and cattle grazing. We currently enjoy good natural drainage, which is crucial to the sustainability of our land and agricultural activities. The proposed road threatens to significantly disrupt these natural drainage patterns, exacerbating existing water runoff issues. Recent developments around our property have already altered the flow of water, leading to flooding and standing water issues, especially following the heavy storm systems of 2023 and 2024. The addition of the Will T Connector Road will only compound these problems, leading to further degradation of our land and making it increasingly difficult to sustain our agricultural activities. The	2.Outreach to landowners	2. Gazettal of land for the corridor can/should only occur after the detailed design once CIG gives instruction to NRA to proceed to that phase. CIG (and more specifically the Ministry responsible for Roads) will have had a chance to review all comments received for the EWA Extension ES document – the opportunity will then exist for CIG to seek (if it desires) an alteration of the corridor alignment and have the NRA to carry out an assessment update on the impacts of the changed alignment (a framework would have to be developed for such future assessment). Such change to the alignment would be incorporated in the detailed design stage (outside of the EIA). Upon completion of the detailed design, then gazettal of the road corridor can be initiated pursuant to Section 3 and Section 6 of the Roads Act.
		EastWest Arterial should in no way alter or compromise the natural drainage patterns that we rely on. Please note that not one inch of		The EAB does not make a decision on the approval of the road gazettal, and the EIA process allows



#	Date	Public Comment	Торіс	Response
		Parcel [parcel information redacted] is for sale and any attempt at compulsory acquisition will be strongly resisted. Moreover, we have not seen any clear timeline for when a decision will be made regarding the Will T Connector Road. It is also unclear		landowners and members of the public to have an opportunity to provide feedback on the design of the road. This information is provided to the decision- maker (in this case, Cabinet).
		<ul> <li>whether affected landowners will be directly contacted before a final decision is reached. We strongly urge the Board to clarify the following:</li> <li>Will landowners be consulted before a final decision is</li> </ul>	3.Farmland impacts	3. Noted. The EIA was developed based on the EAB Scoping Opinion and Terms of Reference (ToR). The development of the ToR included conducting 2 public meetings where stakeholders and members of the public provided comments that were used to further
		<ul> <li>made?</li> <li>Will land surveys be conducted to fully assess the environmental and economic impacts on existing properties?</li> <li>How will the concerns of affected landowners be factored into the decision-making process?</li> </ul>		refine the ToR. Farmlands were not specifically identified as an anticipated impact for evaluation within the EIA when either the Scoping Opinion was finalized in November 2021 or when the ToR was finalized in April 2023.
		Furthermore, regarding the overall East-West Arterial extension, we strongly believe that the road alignment in Section 3 should be adjusted to the north to avoid farmlands and preserve vital agricultural areas.		EIAs utilise either existing data or the consultants are required to produce new baseline data sets, if warranted. The agricultural or farmland in Cayman has not been identified and mapped by the Department of
		We respectfully request that the Environmental Assessment Board carefully consider these concerns and provide a clear response regarding how landowner input will be incorporated into the final decision. We urge the Board to take proactive measures to engage with affected landowners before any irreversible decisions are made.		Agriculture; and therefore, there is no official data set to use in the analyses carried out in the EIA. Under s.21 of the Development & Planning Regulations land which is zoned Agricultural/Residential has restricted density, particularly where it is either situated over a water lens or is considered suitable for agriculture.
		Thank you for your time and attention to this matter. We look forward to your response.		
W 11	4 Feb 2025	Hi	Mastic Road	See Section 6.1.1: Roadway Features: The width of the proposed roadway and corridor would initially be


#	Date	Public Comment	Торіс	Response
		To whom this may concern Could the "Mastic Road" be used next to the Fire station to connection to Frank Sound Rd.? It is already there as a dirt road, it is South of Mastic Trail so not affecting it with few farmer's fields Just a suggestion		approximately 80 feet (24.4 m) in the 2026 build and would potentially be up to 220 feet (67.1 m) wide by 2060. This needed width of disturbance would directly impact homes and displace residents along the existing Mastic Trail road if the project were to follow this alignment; and therefore, this option was not pursued. The alignment of the Proposed Project would result in no residential impacts/displacements with only the Frank Sound fire station impacted. This is compared to the 6 residential impacts/displacements that would result from an alignment that uses the existing Mastic Road in addition to impacting the Frank Sound fire station. Additionally, an alignment along this road would also impact National Trust Land and the trailhead of the Mastic Trail.
W 12	4 Feb 2025	EWA EIA ES Comments All quotes from the DRAFT Non-Technical Summary (unless otherwise noted)		Comments noted and Page 42 correction incorporated. Concerns noted and Meagre Bay Pond language updated.
		<ul> <li>Purpose (of project; that if not met means failure)         <ul> <li>"a multimodal corridor, which means that different types of travel, like driving, biking, and walking, can occur within the corridor"</li> <li>"improve traffic conditions between the eastern and western districts of Grand Cayman"</li> <li>"strengthen resiliency by adding a second travel route between districts"; "offer easier and more timely access" between districts; "an additional resilient travel route between the districts" "since the existing coastal road is often compromised</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		Suggestions noted.



#	Date	Public Comment	Торіс	Response
		during storm events"		
			1.CSFs for	1. Based on public comment and feedback, the EWA EIA
		Comments	Excellent/	project team is conducting additional analyses to adjust
		<ul> <li>I compliment you on your EIA website which</li> </ul>	Acceptable	the Proposed Project profile design to accommodate
		assembles the information and issues and quite	Fit	Acceptable Fit criteria that will be defined and
		rightly identifies the important necessity of an EIA		described within the Final Environmental Statement.
		for projects such as this.		The documentation will articulate how the Acceptable
		<ul> <li>The inclusion of noise (and air, GHG, and other)</li> </ul>		Fit conceptual design meets the established Critical
		pollution in the considerations of the EIA are		Success Factors.
		appreciated. These are often under-considered		
		issues in local development.	2.Remove	2. See Section 6.6.9: Intersections for discussion of the
		<ul> <li>It is clear that unless the full road as proposed is</li> </ul>	intersections	proposed intersection types and placement along the
		constructed (using a phased approach but not		corridor, including how U-turns locations are provided
		where later phases are abandoned as short-		to accommodate emergency vehicles.
		sightedly expensive) then many if not all but one of		
		the critical success factors will be a failure.		See Section 7.4.7: Safety for discussion of anticipated
		Therefore any temptation much less decision to		safety impacts of the Proposed Project.
		construct less than the planned and studied road	0.00	
		must be rejected. Indeed some guarantee of full	3. B3	3. See Chapter 5: Assessment of Alternatives Analysis
		project construction would be beneficial.	selection	and Appendix E – Shortlist [Alternatives] Evaluation of
		• The report clearly shows that critical success		the Environmental Statement for chronology and
		Criteria (d) will not be achieved by the road (and		selection of the Proposed Project route.
		pernaps cannot be achieved). Ineretore it is even	1 Dhaoing	4. For Duild Voor 2024, the sidewalk and migromobility
		more important that the other success criteria be	4.Phasing	4. FOI Build Year 2030, the sidewark and find offootbuilty
		achieved if building the toda is to be justified. Any		the section, particularly pear already developed areas
		proposition rejected in favour of a fuller transport 8		since it is assumed that these particips of the section
		development plan (not just an NPA read plan) to		would see the most use (Areas near Frank Sound Road
		achieve the identified peeds for this infrastructure		to Mastic Trail for example). Other portions of the
		nroject		section were not considered in 2036 due to the
		$p_{10}$ p_{10} $p_{10}$ $p_{10}$ $p$		remoteness of the area and lack of development
		include 1/5 acres (59 acres) of impervious surface		Should further developments arise in these areas in
		area " Should be 59 hectares		



#	Date	Public Comment	Торіс	Response
		Concerns		Section 3, the facilities can be constructed as needed when funding is available.
		<ul> <li>Land use charrette excluded the Department of</li> </ul>		
		Agriculture as technical representative of an	5.Cost	5. See Appendix F.7: Construction Cost Estimates for a
		important stakeholder issue (agriculture / urbanisation) which the EWA will cause problems for. O Considering that sea level rise was not included	estimate	more detailed breakdown of which materials were considered at this stage of evaluation. Items, such as highway lighting were included in the cost estimate. The Final Environmental Statement document will more
		within the EIA modelling it is clearly even more necessary that the full height road be constructed if the critical success factor of a resilient redundant		clearly indicate which asterisked features were considered in the cost.
		road is to be achieved. Anything less will result in a	6. 6.2.3	6. Noted.
		failure of the project.	"Other Area	
		<ul> <li>Page 43: "The Meagre Bay Pond has no connection</li> </ul>	Intersection	
		to groundwater." This statement would seem to be	Improvement	
		counter to visible fluctuations of the water levels of	S″	
		the quarry and the pond with tidal cycles as	7 5	
		observed for years. Which appears to indicate that	7.Frank	7. Noted.
		in these areas. You should evaluate the	sound File	
		separation of these waterbodies and their	Relocation	
		connection to 'underground water' from the	Costs	
		aroundwater	00313	
		giounanatori	8. Solar Array	8. Noted.
		Suggestions	5	
		<ul> <li>Remove completely the (secondary) intersections,</li> </ul>	9.Non-	9. Noted.
		making this arterial a proper bypass and achieving	technical	
		the stated success factors. At the very least the	summary	
		northern intersections need to be removed. (There	clarity	
		may be financial reasons to leave in those where		
		the EWA crosses existing roads, though flyovers of	10.004	10 Neted The otilized terms in the mean data the left of
		those roads would be preferred to allow the EWA to	IU.CBA	10. Noted. The utilised terminology and methodology is
		achieve its critical success factors.	penerit clarity	from UK Transport Appraisal



#	Date	Public Comment	Торіс	Response
		<ul> <li>The "storm water management basins" should be constructed as swales parallel to</li> </ul>		Guidance.
		the roadway, which will help to ensure that	11. Resiliency	11. Noted. Resiliency varies with the elevation at which
		intersections are not added over time as a	criteria	the road is constructed. Roads built at lower elevations
		back-door approach to causing the EWA to		are more susceptible to frequent inundation, whereas
		fail to meet its critical success factors in the		those constructed at higher elevations experience
		longer term.		significantly reduced exposure to such risks. Based on
		<ul> <li>The partial-access U-turn connectors will</li> </ul>		public comment and feedback, the EWA EIA Project
		become accident black spots and decrease		leam is conducting additional analyses to adjust the
		safety on the EWA, thereby invalidating one		Proposed Project profile design to accommodate
		of the stated critical success factors. They should be removed		Acceptable Fit criteria that will be defined and
		Though 'omorgonou accoss' roads may be		The documentation will articulate how the Accontable
		- mough emergency access roads may be usefully added on the southern houndary		Fit concentual design meets the established Critical
		to be used with police traffic controls for		Success Factors
		emergency services or emergency traffic		
		redirection.	12. CSF	12. Additional information regarding the cost reduction
		<ul> <li>Only the Full Access roundabouts should be</li> </ul>	Achievement	options has been incorporated into Section 6.3 of the
		retained to allow the maximum and safest		Environmental Statement.
		flow on the EWA & to achieve the critical		
		success factors without which there is no		
		viable justification for this road.		
		<ul> <li>Adopt route B2 as the better (if only slightly)</li> </ul>		
		alternative route. With no (reasonable) justification		
		given for choosing B3 there is no reason not to		
		utilise route B2 and therefore any other decision is		
		illogical and will result in a suboptimal project		
		which, while not quite a failure, should still be		
		avoided.		
		<ul> <li>IVICROMOBILITY CORRIGON (Including sidewalk &amp; solar</li> </ul>		
		panel canopy) needs to be moved from the 2046 to		
		Ine 2036 phase (or Into the 2036 phase for section 3 rether then (as required)) as it is an important		
		<ul> <li>alternative route b2 us the better (in only slightly) alternative route. With no (reasonable) justification given for choosing B3 there is no reason not to utilise route B2 and therefore any other decision is illogical and will result in a suboptimal project which, while not quite a failure, should still be avoided.</li> <li>Micromobilty corridor (including sidewalk &amp; solar panel canopy) needs to be moved from the 2046 to the 2036 phase (or into the 2036 phase for section 3 rather than 'as required') as it is an important</li> </ul>		



#	Date	Public Comment	Торіс	Response
		component of achieving the project's critical		
		success factors and the road cannot be considered		
		success if they are not an early success of the		
		project. Further this corridor as presented is		
		important to other National priorities, e.g., climate		
		change & energy policies, and advancing their		
		construction (along with government ensuring that		
		the public transport corridor is constructed in the		
		2026 phase, and used properly) should push the		
		need for the expansion single-occupancy car lanes		
		from 2036 to 2046.		
		• The cost estimates either need to more clearly show		
		that they include things asterisked as "these		
		features are outside of the ambit of the NRA. The		
		NRA will provide the ability for the corridor to		
		accommodate these features." For example the		
		highway lighting (a safety feature without which		
		another critical success factor will fail to be		
		achieved). Or the cost estimates need to be redone		
		to show the true cost of constructing the EWA as		
		designed & required to meet all of its critical		
		success factors. (Except actually shortening travel		
		times in near term, which we all know additional		
		roads cannot do. At least not on their own. So this		
		critical success factor will not materialise.)		
		• Given that the 'shorter travel times' critical		
		success factor will materially not		
		materialise you should stop the politicians		
		from lying to people and claiming that it		
		will, much less the absurdly extragavant		
		time savings brayed about by politicians in		
		your public meetings. This just sets the EWA		
		and the NRA process up for failure. Be		



#	Date	Public Comment	Topic	Response
		bravely honest with the politicians and the		
		public.		
		<ul> <li>Similarly you may be considering restating</li> </ul>		
		the costs in response to political demands.		
		But if you do so you need to make clear in		
		that restatement to the politicians and the		
		public that the estimates are made without		
		inflation adjustment. Therefore the actual		
		final cost will be higher than the estimate. Ii		
		the costs are being restated they should be		
		restated fairly as they will be judged at the		
		end of the project. Not during		
		electioneering.		
		<ul> <li>You should include the 6.2.3 "Other Area</li> </ul>		
		Intersection Improvements" as an integral part of		
		the EWA, for all of the reasons you outline.		
		The Cost (Benefits) Analysis needs to show that the		
		ROW (or mitigation) Costs include the possible		
		"removal and relocation of the Frank Sound Fire		
		Station" (p.36). (Even if it is just a transfer of funds		
		from one CIG capital project to another and the		
		temptation of CIG will be to hide that cost. If it were		
		a private building of that socioeconomic value it		
		would be part of the ROW costs. As it should be a		
		(7.1.3) mitigation consideration that is		
		implemented it should be clearly part of the cost of		
		the road.)		
		• The GHG analysis (thank you for including that)		
		makes it clear that the solar array is an important		
		mitigating factor for the road. It must be included in		
		the final build plan and is another reason that the		
		micromobility & high-occupancy lanes need to be		
		included in the 2036 / 2econd building phase. They		



#	Date	Public Commer	nt	Торіс	Response
#	Date	o o	are vital to the road being a net benefit rather than a net negative for the country. Future EIA Non-Technical ES should adopt a more problem/solution narrative. Especially where you only have a few key versions of the project to choose from. As it is now it is difficult to tell from the current approach what are the mitigation considerations that are needed and will be implemented, e.g. road height for particular storm risks or bridge numbers for hydrological connectivity, and their associated costs (and benefits). I fear the result will be that the decision makers will not properly use the information now available to them and the result will be a bad road looked on by history as a mistake, a waste of money, and a missed opportunity. Future EIAs, at least their Non-Technical ES, should abandon the double-speak that (7.9) "The term "benefit" in the CBA refers to the impacts of the project, both positive and negative". Rather what you are performing, I suggest, is a Cost Impact Analysis. Since an impact can both be beneficial and negative. And of course the impacts (positive & negative) have their own costs (either to achieve or to avoid; or costed to allow comparisons in a Costed Impact Analysis). – In fact it would be possible to make this change now to this ES as some parts, e.g., 7.9.1.3, already refer to benefits and negative impacts. It would greatly improve the clarity of the ES.		Response
		Comme	ents		



#	Date	Public Comment	Topic	Response
#	Date	<ul> <li>Public Comment         <ul> <li>We expect that whatever is built will implement all of the various 'mitigation considerations' scattered throughout the EIA. This is another reason the 'best' version of the project has to be built. Otherwise the social (and environmental) costs of the road will be greater than its benefits and the road will be remembered as a mistake and a failure of the Government that implemented it in such a thoughtless manner when they had the chance and information to do it right.</li> <li>The road (at least parts of it) needs to be built at the full/maximum planned height. 7.5.2.1 indicates that (a) the 50 year storm was the design storm; and (b) The road would still be flooded by 100 year storms. We have seen recent examples of places getting hit twice in a year by hundred year hurricanes. This fits with the projections of more large heavy-rain hurricanes in the future (climate change). So the desire to cheap out and build a substandard road must be resisted or the project will end up a failure.</li> <li>8.1, degree of critical success factor achieved</li> <li>D - travel times – This cannot be moderate/large as the travel time will not decrease in a large or even moderate way. (As evidenced by the politicians railing against the study since it doesn't tell them what they want to hear and what they have insinuated to their voters.) Particularly as</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Topic	Response
		future travel times are accounted separately in CSF c. (See also the claim for CSF g, but to a lesser extent.)		



#	Date	Public Comment	Topic	Response
		<ul> <li>You can only assess these 'achievements'</li> </ul>		
		relative to the amount of project		
		completion (and other choices such as road		
		heights within that project completion).		
		Therefore this table needs a few more		
		columns to be truthful. For example if the		
		'cheap' option is taken where the road is		
		built low and without utility, public transit,		
		and micromobility corridors included, then		
		clearly those will not be achieved. This goes		
		back to my comment that you need to		
		present the impacts per project		
		implementation scenario to properly		
		present the positive & negative impacts of		
		the project to be chosen between.		
		<ul> <li>Ideally this improved table would include</li> </ul>		
		the BCR for each CSE to quantify what is		
		meant by the level of benefit (or dishenefit)		
		CSE Full Build Partial Build Chean Build		
		A Large Benefit (BCR 1.8) Medium Benefit (BCR 1.5) Low Benefit (BCR 1.2)		
		B         Medium Benefit (BCR 1.5         Achieved (BCR 1)         Fail (BCR 0.8)		
		C		



#	Date	Public Comment	Topic	Response
W	23 Jan	Comment:	1. Cost	1. See Section 6.2.1 Construction Cost and Section 6.3:
13	2025	<ul> <li>We need a Second houl ASAP</li> <li>but it does not have to Ost I billow</li> <li>\$\$\$171 II does not need all the Fanery</li> <li>Budges - and it does not need to be</li> <li>15'to 20' above sea level.</li> <li>(2) Where are the finits to build this found</li> <li>coming From?</li> <li>(3) Do we have enough fill availle locally</li> <li>to construct this woodway. Porticulary</li> <li>if is going to be built up so high.</li> </ul>		Value Engineering and Future Cost Reduction Considerations for more information related to timeline of potential costs for the project and potential cost savings, particularly the use of a 25-year or less design storm. The Final Environmental Statement will provide further information on potential lower cost options that may be done initially. Resiliency varies with the elevation at which the road is constructed. Roads built at lower elevations are more susceptible to frequent inundation, whereas those constructed at higher elevations experience significantly reduced exposure to such risks. Based on public comment and feedback, the EWA EIA Project Team is conducting additional analyses to adjust the Proposed Project profile design to accommodate Acceptable Fit criteria that will be defined and described within the Final Environmental Statement. The documentation will articulate how the Acceptable Fit conceptual design monte the ostablished Critical Success Factors
			2. Funding 3. Aggregate availability	<ul> <li>2. Funding is outside the scope of the EIA and would be determined in a later step (see Section 17.3: Future Steps of the Environmental Statement).</li> <li>3. Quarries and availability of aggregate is addressed in Section 11.2.5: Quarries of the Environmental Statement. Based on the estimated aggregate volume in the authorised commercial quarries and estimated quantities for the Proposed Project, the Proposed Project would require a maximum of 10-15% of the available aggregate within authorised commercial quarries</li> </ul>



#	Date	Public Comment	Topic	Response
W	23 Jan	Comment:	Traffic at	The NRA acknowledges the need to address the other
14	2025	What remediation is planned for the same bottle-neck when cars mean neat at Tomkinson Roundabut and then again at thereby's?	Tomlinson	traffic congestion locations on the island and is determining possible solutions to those issues which are outside of the EIA for the EWA Extension.
W 15	23 Jan 2025	Comment: My NAME is OF DF BACK TO THE ORIGINAL POSSITION ASS THIS WILL AFFECT THE PROPERTY THAT WAS Allocated For It INITED PROPOSED KOAD.	Alignment location	Noted. An assessment of alternatives was completed as part of the EIA and found in Chapter 5: Assessment of Alternatives Analysis of the Environmental Statement.



Appendix N.2 – Slido Comments and Responses

Environmental Statement, East-West Arterial Extension – Section 2 and Section 3, Grand Cayman

The review and comment period for the Draft ES was instituted to collect questions, comments, and thoughts from the community on the studies completed for the EWA Extension Project, Sections 2 and 3. The Project Team sincerely appreciates your time, interest, and efforts in preparing and submitting your comments for this project. We have carefully and thoroughly reviewed your comments and offer the following in response.

#	Date	Slido Application Submitted Comment	Торіс	Response
51	21 Jan 2025	Will the Government publish the business case for this road? If no business case how was it approved without one? And how will we know it is value for money?	Business Case/Value For Money	The NRA has completed a Cost-Benefit Analysis as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment. See <b>Chapter 16: Cost-</b> <b>Benefit Analysis</b> and <b>Appendix M – Cost-Benefit Analysis</b> of the Environmental Statement. Government publication of the business case is outside the ambit of the NRA and this EIA.
52	21 Jan 2025	Why wasn't farmland considered in the terms of reference for the EIA?	Farmland	<ul> <li>Farmlands were not specifically identified as an anticipated impact for evaluation within the EIA when either the Scoping Opinion was finalized in November 2021 or when the ToR was finalized in April 2023.</li> <li>EIAs utilise either existing data or the consultants are required to produce new baseline data sets, if warranted.</li> <li>The agricultural or farmland in Cayman has not been identified and mapped by the Department of Agriculture; and therefore, there is no official data set to use in the analyses carried out in the EIA. Agricultural land also has no identified protection under the current Cayman Development Plan, Planning legislation or any other legislation. Under s.21 of the Development &amp; Planning Regulations land which is zoned Agricultural/Residential has restricted density, particularly where it is either situated over a water lens or is considered suitable for agriculture.</li> </ul>



#	Date	Slido Application Submitted Comment	Торіс	Response
53	21 Jan 2025	Road 3 was picked over 2 as recmd by the EAB by 7 politicians 3 of which wanted route 2 how 3 months B4 Election Day can the minister and co justify this?	Preferred Alternative Selection	See Chapter 5: Assessment of Alternatives Analysis and Appendix E – Shortlist [Alternatives] Evaluation of the Environmental Statement for analysis of alternatives, comparative results, chronology and selection of the Proposed Project route. The purpose of the EIA is to inform decision-makers by presenting data and analysis for their consideration. The purpose of the EIA is not to make a recommendation. The final decision was made by Cabinet and not the NRA or the EAB. Neither the NRA nor the EAB can speak to why Cabinet selected B3 other than to say that Cabinet considered B3 was in the best interest of Grand Cayman.
54	21 Jan 2025	Will you be on Radio Cayman so the wider public can learn more?	Public Consultation	The public consultation meetings were not broadcast on Radio Cayman. Streaming of the public consultation meetings were made available on Facebook and YouTube. Physical copies of the Draft Environmental Statement and Non-Technical Summary were also made available to the public in addition to the online availability.
S5	21 Jan 2025	Would an elevated causeway for the entire road length equal less environmental impact eg the Tamiami Trail in the Everglades National Park.	Bridges	See <b>Appendix F.10: Value Engineering Options</b> . An elevated causeway or viaduct system was explored at a high-level of conceptual design as part of the Value Engineering options for the project. While this option may result in less environmental impact, the cost to construct the project in this manner was estimated to be significantly higher than the currently proposed project; and therefore, it was not advanced for further detailed study and consideration. See <b>Section 6.6.7 Bridges</b> for estimated "proof of concept" roadway opening structure locations and lengths.



#	Date	Slido Application Submitted Comment	Торіс	Response
S6	21 Jan	Is there a designated terminal for people to park their	Carpooling	At this stage in the study process the design or use of
	2025	car to allow car pooling		carpooling terminals were not considered. The possible use
				of these features may be considered during the detailed
				design process. Once there is a better understanding of
				government intentions with regards to public transit, these
				elements can be assessed. Furthermore, operational
				attributes of public transit fall outside the ambit of this EIA.
S7	21 Jan	B3 is closer to denser black mangroves which are v	Habitat/Mangrove	Habitat mapping, including parrot nesting habitat, was
	2025	important to breeding parrots. How did you survey the	Mapping	provided by the Department of Environment.
		breeding habitat as no mapped data exists.		
				Differentiated maps covering specific mangrove and other
				tree species habitats were not provided or produced as part
				of the EIA due to lack of current information available. See
				Chapter 13: Terrestrial Ecology of the Environmental
				Statement for additional details.



#	Date	Slido Application Submitted Comment	Торіс	Response
58	21 Jan 2025	Would the acceptable criteria lower the flood risk for surrounding areas as it is less elevated? Essentially the road would flood with the adjacent land.	Flooding	The design criteria for the roadway will be developed to align with the elevations of both current and future land use, ensuring uniformity across the area. This strategy means that, similar to adjacent lands, the roadway may also be vulnerable to flooding during intense storm events. To mitigate this, the design includes the installation of cross drainage stormwater pipes beneath the roadway, specifically engineered to efficiently manage rainfall from less severe storms. However, it is important to acknowledge that in cases of more severe storm events, which cause flooding in the adjacent areas, the roadway might also experience flooding.
				Moving into the detailed design phase, the primary objective will be to design a resilient roadway that functions effectively without causing adverse impacts on the surrounding areas. This 'do no harm' approach ensures that while the road itself may experience flooding similar to adjacent land at lower elevations, it will not exacerbate flooding or negatively affect nearby areas.
S9	21 Jan 2025	I would like to see consideration for safe ped/micro- mobility crossings at any planned roundabouts or key developments along the causeway.	Pedestrian Crossings	This feature was not included in the initial study phase since it requires additional design details not yet provided. A pedestrian crossing assessment is recommended as part of detailed design (outside of the EIA). See Section 6.6.9.6: Intersection Design Considerations and Section 8.4.2.2 Severance (Will T Connector and Neighborhoods) within the Environmental Statement which discuss pedestrian crossings.



#	Date	Slido Application Submitted Comment	Торіс	Response
S10	21 Jan	Govt stated B3 was chosen for its alignment w/ its	Preferred	The EIA was developed from the data presented in the
	2025	long-term infrastructure vision. What infrastructure	Alternative	Assessment of Alternatives (see Appendix E – Shortlist
		would B3 & not B2 accommodate? Cargo port in	Selection	[Alternatives] Evaluation) which led to the results presented
		Breakers?		in Chapter 5: Assessment of Alternatives Analysis. The NRA
				and consultant team were not privy to the detailed rationale
				of the governmental decision regarding the strategic future
				projects envisaged for the next 50 years, which is the design
				life of the project. The EAB Chair signed off on the Shortlist
				document, which resulted in the EIA proceeding to the
				Proposed Project.
S11	21 Jan	The protective boundary described as a benefit of B3 -	Development	Implementation of planning or development restrictions is
	2025	what would be required to have a policy or legal	Restrictions	outside the ambit of the NRA. However, this project can
		method of implementing this?		initiate collaborative discussion between various
				governmental departments to define suitable policies
				outside of the EIA process.
<i>S12</i>	23 Jan	I would like to see consideration for safe ped/micro-	Pedestrian	This feature was not included in the initial study phase since
	2025	mobility crossings at any planned roundabouts or key	Crossings	it requires additional design details not yet provided. A
		developments along the causeway.		pedestrian crossing assessment is recommended as part of
				detailed design (outside of the EIA). See Section 6.6.9.6:
				Intersection Design Considerations and Section 8.4.2.2
				Severance (Will I Connector and Neighborhoods) within the
				Environmental Statement which discuss pedestrian
C12	22 / 000	What is the planned time forms for finalizing the FC	Timeline	Crossings.
513	23 Jan	what is the planned time frame for finalizing the ES	Timeline	The Final ES and EIVIP are anticipated to be completed in the
C14	2025	and EMP?	Northorn cocco	second quarter of 2025 (April 1 – June 30).
514	23 Jun	the compromise to protoct the CMM/ North concern	Northern access	Access intersections will be subject to further discussions
	2025	intercontions chould not be included in the plane	intersections	access intersections presented within the Environmental
		intersections should not be included in the plans.		Statement are based on existing registered rights of way
				Statement are based on existing registered rights-of-Way.



#	Date	Slido Application Submitted Comment	Торіс	Response
S15	23 Jan 2025	Travel time reductions, especially for Bodden Town, seem minimal, just a saving of 3-4 minutes in 2026. What can to be done to improve that?	Travel time reductions	See <b>Section 7.4.5 Travel Time</b> for discussion on anticipated travel time improvements of the Proposed Project. Travel time benefits increase over time as the EWA Extension is lengthened/widened, providing access to more people. It is outside the ambit of this EIA to address traffic congestion west of Hirst Road.
<i>\$16</i>	23 Jan 2025	Why were the basic road drawings not presented instead of the Cadillac version? This is a lot more expensive and prohibitive time wise.	Cost	See Section 6.1.1: Roadway Features of the Environmental Statement for the potential progression of roadway features. This EIA process initially examined alternatives that would best meet the identified critical success factors that had been established at the beginning of the project. This analysis investigated a range of alternatives to provide a fully resilient corridor when considering more moderate storm events. As a result of comments received on the Draft Environmental Statement, further analysis of a baseline, lower cost alternative will be completed and provided in the Final Environmental Statement, along with other considerations for potential cost reduction savings. As part of the EIA process, it is prudent to start with the most resilient option against storms and then adjust it based on what is feasible and affordable. Establishing a cost baseline for the most resilient option first allows for a more informed decision-making process, ensuring that sustainability does not compromise economic viability.
S17	23 Jan 2025	What are the intended speed limits for the EWA highway	Speed limits	See <b>Section 6.6: Design Criteria and Methodology</b> . The intended posted speed limit anticipated for the project is 50 miles per hour (mph).
S18	23 Jan 2025	How is the EWA construction being funded by Government	Funding	The specifics for funding are outside the scope of this EIA and would be determined as the project progresses (see <b>Section 17.3: Future Steps</b> of the Environmental Statement).



#	Date	Slido Application Submitted Comment	Торіс	Response
\$19	23 Jan 2025	If the change to the Conservation law goes through, how will that let Cabinet push the road through without this EIA, like Min. Bryan said on the radio?	NCA Amendments	The specific components within potential NCA amendments are outside the scope of this EIA. The requirements necessary for addressing any future amendments would be determined as future amendments are approved. This ES is compliant with the Final Terms of Reference for the EWA Extension EIA.
<i>\$20</i>	23 Jan 2025	So if building the cheaper road means no Critical Success Factors: utility, public transit, or immediate travel time improvements, etc., will it not be built?	CSFs	Refer to Section 6.3: 'Value Engineering and Future Cost Reduction Considerations' in the Environmental Statement for detailed insights into potential cost-saving measures for the corridor. It's important to note that these cost-saving options, including the choice to build a lower-cost road, are designed to be implemented without compromising the project's ability to meet its Critical Success Factors. The Value Engineering approach ensures that essential elements such as utilities and public transit components are not only retained but effectively integrated within the corridor's design. Additionally, this strategic inclusion guarantees that the project will still provide resiliency, support utility needs, facilitate public transit, and improve travel times, even at a reduced cost.
521	23 Jan 2025	How is this supposed to alleviate traffic with that many intersections & U-Turns? Drop the intersections, make it a proper bypass.	Intersections	See Section 6.6.9: Intersections for discussion of the proposed intersection types and placement along the corridor. See Section 7.4.6: Intersection Delay for discussion on the anticipated intersection delay improvements of the Proposed Project.



#	Date	Slido Application Submitted Comment	Торіс	Response
522	23 Jan 2025	Was the computerized traffic model developed by the NRA in 2015 updated & validated. As the current drive times illustrated in the presentation seem optimistic	Traffic model	The traffic volumes and travel times were the primary metrics used to determine calibration of the AM and PM peak hour VISUM model assignments. The model produced traffic volumes and journey times within the validation criteria established by WebTag Unit M3-1. For the four travel time corridors along Shamrock Road / Bodden Town Road and Frank Sound Road, the model produced journey times within 15% or one minute of the NRA's field-collected travel times, satisfying the validation criteria for all travel routes during both AM and PM peak hours and ensuring that modeled route times reflect field conditions appropriately. Based on this comparison against field-collected traffic volume and travel time data, the Grand Cayman Travel Demand Model vehicle assignment is considered well calibrated for both AM and PM peak hours.
				See Section 7.2.2.4: Travel Demand Model and Appendix E - Shortlist [Alternatives] Evaluation: Attachment A – Traffic [Transportation & Mobility] – Assessment of Alternatives for detailed discussion of the model development and subsequent data collection, calibration, and validation efforts completed as part of this study. Modelling validation and calibration will continue to be updated on a regular basis as part of the NRA Strategic Operation plans.



#	Date	Slido Application Submitted Comment	Торіс	Response
S23	23 Jan	In other words, not building 'excellent fit' will fail the	CSFs	See Table 6-1: Critical Success Factors List – Engineering
	2025	critical success factor? So why show the other options?		Evaluation of the Environmental Statement. The 'acceptable
		What is the actual success factors being used?		fit' can still meet the Critical Success Factors as outlined in
				the table. It is important to understand that while the
				'excellent fit' option aligns closely with the project's goals,
				presenting other options allows for a robust discussion and
				comparison based on varying budgets, timelines, and
				potential impacts. This inclusive approach ensures that all
				stakeholders are aware of the trade-offs and benefits
				associated with each option. Ultimately, the Critical Success
				Factors used to evaluate these options include safety,
				functionality, cost-effectiveness, environmental
				sustainability, and community impact, ensuring that the
				chosen solution best serves the needs of all parties involved.



#	Date	Slido Application Submitted Comment	Торіс	Response
S24	23 Jan	How much more dangerous will the narrower roads	Design criteria	The Grand Cayman Roadway design will always be
	2025	be? How can you put the price without human lives		developed to prevent any human life loss, as long as the
		cost included?		participants in traffic follow the traffic regulations and drive
				responsibly. A concrete median barrier is included within the
				Proposed Project conceptual design to delineate bi-
				directional traffic, which can reduce risk of crashes to occur
				by over 80% according to the United States Federal Highway
				Administration.
				Regarding the narrower road, see Section 6.3: Value
				Engineering and Future Cost Reduction Considerations and
				Section 6.6: Design Criteria and Methodology of the
				Environmental Statement for required and proposed design
				values. The proposed narrower roads would be designed to
				meet all safety standards, including adhering to the
				minimum standard for lane width. Despite the width
				reductions, these measures ensure the well-being of road
				users is not compromised. Safety features and design
				adjustments would be thoroughly evaluated to comply with
				traffic safety guidelines.



#	Date	Slido Application Submitted Comment	Торіс	Response
S25	23 Jan 2025	Is it logical to plan for smaller storms given climate change? Whose idea was that?	Resiliency criteria	We recognize the importance of building infrastructure that is both resilient and sustainable, particularly in response to the changing climate patterns.
				A Risk Analysis is an integral part of the overall EWA Extension project, scheduled to be conducted following the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process. This analysis will help identify and select a roadway design that meets standards of resiliency against the defined Critical Success Factors. The findings from the Risk Analysis will be incorporated into the Cayman Islands Government Detailed Business Case, ensuring the approach is thoroughly evaluated and justified.
				There is a balance between multiple considerations when designing infrastructure to withstand storm events, including the potential impacts, the cost of construction, and the materials required. Designing and constructing for the more extreme storm events would require significantly more resources and higher elevations, leading to substantial increases in costs.
				Therefore, the project's strategy aims to optimise resiliency by preparing for more frequent weather events, ensuring that the design is both practical and cost-effective. This balanced approach ensures that the roadway not only withstands likely storm events but also remains economically viable and aligned with the long-term sustainability goals of the community and the environment. NRA's commitment is to deliver a project that offers durability, safety, and environmental stewardship, ensuring that the infrastructure serves the needs of the Cayman Islands both today and in the future.



#	Date	Slido Application Submitted Comment	Торіс	Response
<i>\$26</i>	23 Jan 2025	How is the traffic flow of the EWA affected by each connector (eg Will T connector) that is added along the new highway?	Intersections and traffic flow	See <b>Section 6.6.9: Intersections</b> for details on the proposed intersections along the corridor. At Agricola Connector and Frank Sound Road, roundabouts are planned to be installed, while a Restricted Crossing U-Turn intersection is planned at Lookout Road. The other identified intersection locations are planned to be partial access intersections, providing a left in/left out along with U-turn intersections, which will minimise traffic congestion along the new EWA Extension.
S27	23 Jan 2025	You need a table off benefits per scheme, since you won't get some of those benefits with the less-than- best scenario. So disingenuous.	CSFs	Noted.
S28	23 Jan 2025	How are you minimising parrot nesting impact, when the review shows that you are not?	Parrot nesting habitat impacts	Environmentally sensitive areas, including parrot nesting habitats, were considered when determining the alignment for the corridor. Additional objectives and constraints were considered when determining the alignment of the corridor and can be found in <b>Chapter 2: Project Objectives and Key</b> <b>Constraints</b> .



S2923 Jan 2025Which highway in Cayman do you see built at 15 to 20 feet high, not one. Not Linford Peirson or EasterlyResiliencyThe conceptual design of the East-WestContractContractContractContractContractContract
Tibbetts Why is it required for the East West Arterial?       Usections 2 and 3) has been approached planning emphasis on resiliency as it relievents to meet the anticipated challenge change. This proactive approach is in restructure the more severe weather events, reflecting imodern road design and engineering.         Refer to Section 6.3: Value Engineering.       Refer to Section 6.3: Value Engineering.         Refer to Section for a detailed analysis. During the initial Extension project, alternatives were evaluation aimed to explore to impact and establish a benchmark for r against a 50-year storm event.         Following this comprehensive analysis, t identified more cost-effective design op elevations, ensuring the roadway remail frequent weather events while also bein cost. This approach balances these facto ensuring that, despite a lower elevation, maintain its functionality and safety und conditions.         These evaluations reflect the committing surveys as a robust co island's infrastructure for decades to co



#	Date	Slido Application Submitted Comment	Торіс	Response
530	23 Jan 2025	If the road is built at a higher elevation what does this mean for development along the road? Will they have to all be built that high as well to avoid floods?	Flooding	The roadway is being designed to best minimise changes to existing flow patterns and flood levels. The extent to which adjacent new developments are constructed to similar elevations to the roadway is directly dependent on the criteria established for those developments and the approval processes necessary for each development. Implementation of planning or development requirements is outside the ambit of the NRA.
531	23 Jan 2025	~if construction docs are to be prepared, have the design firms been selected for that engineering effort? ~same team as ES?	Detailed design consultant	The NRA is required to prepare a tender document for detailed design at the completion of the EIA – the scope of works for such exercise have yet to be completed. The Procurement Law governs all the Government Procurement procedure for tendering projects and the NRA operates in accordance to the Law. The detail design consultant will be awarded following a formal public tendering process. All interested design consultancy bidders will be evaluated based on the project specific tender documentation which will be published on the Government Public Procurement Platform – Bonfire in due course.
<i>\$32</i>	23 Jan 2025	Most of the stated benefits can be implemented without building the road. Has there been any consideration of national strategy to achieve these?	CSFs	The NRA is the proponent of the project. The Proposed Project has been designed to meet the established Critical Success Factors that include the specific purpose and need for this project. The evaluation of potential National strategies is outside the ambit of the NRA and outside the scope of this EIA.
533	23 Jan 2025	If our questions not answered tonight, how we get answers later? Public Report with answers?	Public consultation	Comments received during the public consultation period (written, verbal, or via the Slido application) and responses are appended to the Final Environmental Statement, as directed within the EIA Directive.
<i>\$34</i>	23 Jan 2025	There are 14 bridges that are 300feet long. This is half of the cost of the project. OMG	Costs/Bridges	Noted.



#	Date	Slido Application Submitted Comment	Торіс	Response
S35	23 Jan	Will it take 50 years to build the entire road and	Construction	See Section 6.1: Corridor Features and Timeline to view the
	2025	therefore benefit residents? Or is the 50 years more	sequencing	anticipated timeline of project features. As shown, it is not
		for the "extras" such as mobility lanes etc?		anticipated to take 50 years for residents to make use of the
				proposed project. The current timeline of the project is
				envisioned to have construction of the first two travel lanes
				begin in year 2026. Construction is planned to continue for a
				few years before the new road will be open for public use.
				The remaining timeline of 50 years is for the other additional
				components of the project that include an additional two
				travel lanes, a sidewalk, and dedicated transit lanes among
				other features. The overall construction sequencing and
				implementation of corridor features will be based on
				demand and available funding.
536	23 Jan	Traffic will still all meet at Tomlinson Roundabout and	Traffic congestion	See Section 7.4.5: Travel Time for discussion on anticipated
	2025	Hurley's. How will this extension alleviate the overall	at Iomlinson	travel time improvements of the Proposed Project, including
		time in traffic if we all meet in the same place		travel times west of Hirst Road.
				The NPA acknowledges the need to address the other traffic
				congestion locations on the island and is determining
				possible solutions to those issues outside of the EIA for the
				FW/A Extension
				The project is being developed by the NRA to meet the
				Critical Success Factors which include reducing traffic
				congestion as well as other identified considerations.
				Projects of the scale of the EWA Extension take time to
				properly plan, develop, fund, and construct. Pro-actively
				examining both current and future needs results in more
				cost effective and less impactful projects. If the planning,
				design, and construction of the EWA Extension is delayed
				until the needs get even worse, then the project would cost
				more to construct and may also result in higher impacts.



#	Date	Slido Application Submitted Comment	Торіс	Response
537	23 Jan 2025	Could the road that joins to Frank Sound road use the dirt road Mastic road? It would not touch South end of the Mastic trail and it wouldn't touch farm land	Alignment shift	See Section 6.1.1: Roadway Features: The width of the proposed roadway and corridor would initially be approximately 80 feet (24.4 m) in the 2026 build and would potentially be up to 220 feet (67.1 m) wide by 2060. This needed width of disturbance would directly impact homes and displace residents along the existing Mastic Trail road if the project were to follow this alignment and therefore this option was not pursued. The alignment of the Proposed Project would result in no residential impacts/displacements with only the Frank Sound fire station impacted. This is compared to the 6 residential impacts/displacements that would result from an alignment that uses the existing Mastic Road in addition to impacting the Frank Sound fire station. Additionally, an alignment along this road would also impact National Trust Land and the trailbead of the Mastic Trail.
S38	23 Jan 2025	Are any green road construction methods considered in the study	Green design	See <b>Section 6.9.6: Sustainability and Resiliency</b> for discussion on the potential use of recycled materials for the project. The EIA presents a concept design proposal; more will be considered as part of the detailed design.
<i>S39</i>	23 Jan 2025	So why did una choose B2 not B3? Can you answer the question.	Preferred Alternative Selection	See Chapter 5: Assessment of Alternatives Analysis and Appendix E – Shortlist [Alternatives] Evaluation of the Environmental Statement for chronology and selection of the Proposed Project route. The purpose of the EIA is to inform decision-makers by presenting data and analysis for their consideration. The purpose of the EIA is not to make a recommendation. The final decision was made by Cabinet and not the NRA or the EAB. Neither the NRA nor the EAB can speak to why Cabinet selected B3 other than to say that Cabinet considered B3 was in the best interest of Grand Cavman.



#	Date	Slido Application Submitted Comment	Торіс	Response
S40	23 Jan	Fact: The road is not all about saving time. It's also	CSFs	Noted.
	2025	about resiliency, and alternate routes.		
S41	23 Jan	Answer Mark Scotland's question. Why choose B2 not	Preferred	See Chapter 5: Assessment of Alternatives Analysis and
	2025	B3? As he showed the only difference reported is that	Alternative	Appendix E – Shortlist [Alternatives] Evaluation of the
		B2 is better (EAB report he said).	Selection	Environmental Statement for chronology and selection of
				the Proposed Project route. The purpose of the EIA is to
				inform decision-makers by presenting data and analysis for
				their consideration. The purpose of the EIA is not to make a
				recommendation. The final decision was made by Cabinet
				and not the NRA or the EAB. Neither the NRA nor the EAB
				can speak to why Cabinet selected B3 other than to say that
				Cabinet considered B3 was in the best interest of Grand
				Cayman.
S42	23 Jan	Why focus on 'sticker shock' if the 'good fit' fails to	CSFs	See Section 6.3: Value Engineering and Future Cost
	2025	achieve critical success factors?		Reduction Considerations and Table 6-1: Critical Success
				Factors List – Engineering Evaluation. The Good Fit still
				achieves the Critical Success Factors while also providing a
642	22.100		Dueferrad	less costly alternative.
543	23 Jan	App E Att K: snowed that B2 is better than B3 at	Alternetive	See Chapter 5: Assessment of Alternatives Analysis and
	2025	the environment. Why was P2 shasen?"	Alternative	Appendix E – Shortiist [Alternatives] Evaluation of the
		the environment. Why was by chosen?	Selection	the Proposed Project route. The purpose of the EIA is to
				inform decision makers by precenting data and analysis for
				their consideration. The nurnose of the EIA is not to make a
				recommendation. The final decision was made by Cabinet
				and not the NRA or the FAB. Neither the NRA nor the FAB
				can sneak to why Cabinet selected B3 other than to say that
				Cabinet considered B3 was in the best interest of Grand
				Cavman.



#	Date	Slido Application Submitted Comment	Торіс	Response
S44	23 Jan 2025	Re the Money for the Road - So where is the business case? Why can't the Govt. answer the money question?	Business Case/Value For Money	The NRA has completed a Cost-Benefit Analysis as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment. See <b>Chapter 16: Cost-</b> <b>Benefit Analysis</b> and <b>Appendix M – Cost-Benefit Analysis</b> of the Environmental Statement. Government publication of the business case is outside the ambit of the NRA and this FIA.
S45	23 Jan 2025	So if the geotextile is cheaper, why would you use anything else? ie, why is geotextile an 'option' and not the 'standard plan'?	Geo-textiles	See Section 6.4: Design Limitations and Section 6.8.7.2: Contingency Plans – Geotechnical Risk Mitigation for insight into the current understanding and uncertainty related to existing soil condition and peat layer depths. While the geosynthetic material is a potential cost saving option, it is unknown at this time as to the exact locations that it can be used in the corridor as its application and cost savings is dependent on existing site conditions. Further geotechnical information related to the existing soil and ground surface needs to be collected in detailed design to fully determine the extent of this option as a feasible alternative.
S46	23 Jan 2025	Preach Dwayne - 1 more hour sleep. If the plan doesn't give that don't build the road. Back to the drawing board and do it right.	Travel time savings	Noted. See <b>Section 7.4.5: Travel Time</b> for travel time savings.
S47	23 Jan 2025	Considering Florida got hit by two '50 year +' storms/floods this year better not drop the risk level just to be cheap.	Resiliency	Noted.
S48	23 Jan 2025	So the critical success factor is 'build a road'? That's a crock of an answer. Stop ducking the storm / resiliency issue.	CSFs	The complete list of Critical Success Factors was made available within <b>Section 2.1: Project Objects</b> of the Environmental Statement, display board 2, the meeting handout, and meeting presentation.
S49	23 Jan 2025	Preach sister. Make a road that will actually make things better. Since the study shows this one will not, the Govt needs a better plan.	Opinion	Noted.



#	Date	Slido Application Submitted Comment	Торіс	Response
S50	23 Jan	Why can't the cheaper option be done first and then	Construction	See Section 6.2.1 Construction Cost and Section 6.3: Value
	2025	increased over time?	sequencing	Engineering and Future Cost Reduction Considerations for
				more information related to timeline of potential costs for
				the project and potential cost savings, particularly the use of
				a 25-year or less design storm. The Final Environmental
				Statement will provide further information on potential
				lower cost options that may be done initially.
S51	23 Jan	This design could never be done by our NRA. This reeks	Design features	Noted.
	2025	of DOE influence that's why the route was changed		
S52	23 Jan	Live Feed went down (again) ~8:45. Looking forward to	Connection issues	Noted.
	2025	the report of all the answers to all the questions.		
<i>S53</i>	23 Jan	This 2060 idealized concept. Where else in the world is	Design features	Within the western hemisphere in the United States and
	2025	this constructed.		Canada, there are numerous instances of elevated roadway
				corridors that contain multiple travel lanes, transit, and
				pedestrian facilities including US 75 Central Expressway in
				Dallas, Texas, US and the South Miami-Dade transit way in
				Florida, US.



## Appendix N.3 – Verbal Comments and Responses

Environmental Statement, East-West Arterial Extension – Section 2 and Section 3, Grand Cayman

The review and comment period for the Draft ES was instituted to collect questions, comments, and thoughts from the community on the studies completed for the EWA Extension Project, Sections 2 and 3. The Project Team sincerely appreciates your time, interest, and efforts in preparing and submitting your comments for this project. We have carefully and thoroughly reviewed your comments and offer the following in response.

Note that verbal comments from the Tuesday, January 21, 2025, public meeting were noted by the moderator as formal comments and therefore are included within this document. Verbal comments from the Thursday, January 23, 2025, public meeting were noted by the moderator as not being formal comments, and therefore are not included within this document.



#	Date	Comment Transcription	Торіс	Verbal Response Transcription	Supplemental Response
V1	21 Jan	Who developed the terms	Terms of	It was Whitman, Requardt and Associates, the	Whitman, Requardt and Associates was the
	2025	of reference for this EIA	Reference	primary consultant, that completed the Terms	primary consultant that compiled the Terms
		study?		of Reference. The Draft Terms of Reference	of Reference (ToR) with input from the
				was published and then we had two public	Project Team that included the National
				meetings.	Roads Authority, the third-party review
					consultant TYLin, and the Environmental
					Assessment Board (EAB). The EAB included
					members from the Department of
					Environment, the Water Authority, the Public
					Works Department, and the Department of
					Planning.



#	Date	Comment Transcription	Торіс	Verbal Response Transcription	Supplemental Response
V2	21 Jan	Why then was farmland	Farmland	The EIA process and the evaluation that was	The EIA was developed based on the EAB
	2025	not considered an		done based was off of scientific analysis and	Scoping Opinion and Terms of Reference
		important and integral		evaluation of the available data that we had	(ToR). The development of the ToR included
		parts of the terms of		available to the project team going through	conducting 2 public meetings where
		reference?		the process. And therefore, the project team	stakeholders and members of the public
				used an unweighted objective approach	provided comments that were used to
				looking at the available data that we had.	further refine the ToR. Farmlands were not
					specifically identified as an anticipated
					impact for evaluation within the EIA when
					either the Scoping Opinion was finalized in
					November 2021 or when the ToR was
					finalized in April 2023.
					EIAs utilise either existing data or the
					consultants are required to produce new
					baseline data sets, if warranted.
					The agricultural or farmland in Cayman bas
					not been identified and mapped by the
					Department of Agriculture: and therefore.
					there is no official data set to use in the
					analyses carried out in the FIA. Agricultural
					land also has no identified protection under
					the current Cayman Development Plan
					Planning legislation or any other legislation
					Under s.21 of the Development & Planning
					Regulations land which is zoned
					Agricultural/Residential has restricted
					density, particularly where it is either
					situated over a water lens or is considered
					suitable for agriculture.


#	Date	Comment Transcription	Торіс	Verbal Response Transcription	Supplemental Response
V3	21 Jan	When you look through	Resources/	We don't have a definitive data source or	The EIA was developed based on the EAB
	2025	this (referring to the map	Farmland	frame of reference to identify (response got	Scoping Opinion and Terms of Reference
		on the screen with the		cutoff).	(ToR). The development of the ToR included
		original route and the new			conducting 2 public meetings where
		proposed route) what do			stakeholders and members of the public
		you see there? You see			provided comments that were used to
		swamp land, mosquito			further refine the ToR. Farmlands were not
		land, you see dry land, you			specifically identified as an anticipated
		see quarries, you see			impact for evaluation within the EIA when
		ponds, you see central			either the Scoping Opinion was finalized in
		mangrove, do you not see			November 2021 or when the ToR was
		farmland?			finalized in April 2023.
					EIAs utilise either existing data or the
					consultants are required to produce new
					baseline data sets, if warranted.
					The emissible and ending Courses have
					The agricultural or farmland in Cayman has
					not been identified and mapped by the
					Department of Agriculture; and therefore,
					there is no official data set to use in the
					analyses carried out in the EIA. Agricultural
					land also has no identified protection under
					the current Cayman Development Plan,
					Planning legislation or any other legislation.
					Under s.21 of the Development & Planning
					Regulations land which is zoned
					Agricultural/Residential nas restricted
					density, particularly where it is either
					situated over a water lens or is considered
					suitable for agriculture.



#	Date	Comment Transcription	Торіс	Verbal Response Transcription	Supplemental Response
V4	21 Jan	Individual asked would the	Farmland	It was not factored in directly because we do	The EIA was developed based on the EAB
	2025	farmland be captured		not have information on where all of the	Scoping Opinion and Terms of Reference
		under different scientific		agricultural land would be on the Island. Since	(ToR). The development of the ToR included
		terms.		that hasn't been established, we couldn't	conducting 2 public meetings where
				equitably account. It would've been factored	stakeholders and members of the public
				in when Lands and Survey provided an	provided comments that were used to
				estimate on the value of the land that was	further refine the ToR. Farmlands were not
				impacted from a property perspective, so	specifically identified as an anticipated
				there would've been a different evaluation to	impact for evaluation within the EIA when
				the mangroves versus an evaluation to	either the Scoping Opinion was finalized in
				agricultural land or developed land. So, the	November 2021 or when the ToR was
				gentleman asking the question is correct, it	finalized in April 2023.
				was not directly account for.	
					EIAs utilise either existing data or the
					consultants are required to produce new
					baseline data sets, if warranted.
					The agricultural or farmland in Cayman has
					not been identified and mapped by the
					Department of Agriculture; and therefore,
					there is no official data set to use in the
					analyses carried out in the EIA. Agricultural
					land also has no identified protection under
					The current Cayman Development Plan,
					Planning legislation or any other legislation.
					Under S.21 of the Development & Planning
					Regulations land which is zoned
					Agricultural/Residential has restricted
					density, particularly where it is either
					situated over a water lens or is considered
					suitable for agriculture.



#	Date	<b>Comment Transcription</b>	Торіс	Verbal Response Transcription	Supplemental Response
V5	21 Jan	Why was route 3 was	B2 vs B3	Our role as an independent consultant, was to	See Chapter 5: Assessment of Alternatives
	2025	picked over route 2?		provide the objective scientific analysis and	Analysis and Appendix E – Shortlist
				information to the decision makers. Therefore,	[Alternatives] Evaluation of the
				the shortlist alternative documents, as well as	Environmental Statement for analysis of
				a briefing from the Environmental Assessment	alternatives, comparative results,
				Board, was provided to the Cabinet, and from	chronology, and selection of the Proposed
				there the Cabinet made the decision.	Project route. The purpose of the EIA is to
					inform decision-makers by presenting data
					and analysis for their consideration. The
					purpose of the EIA is not to make a
					recommendation. The final decision was
					made by Cabinet and not the NRA or the EAB.
					Neither the NRA nor the EAB can speak to
					why Cabinet selected B3 other than to say
					that Cabinet considered B3 was in the best
					interest of Grand Cayman.

V6	21 Jan	Individual concerned	Cost	This EIA process took a conservative worst	See Section 6.1.1: Roadway Features of the
	2025	about the cost. Is the		case scenario approach to meet the critical	Environmental Statement for the potential
		choice at this point in time		success factors that had been established at	progression of roadway features. This EIA
		is designed in a way where		the beginning of the project. One of which	process initially examined alternatives that
		it is cost prohibitive so that		would be to provide a fully resilient corridor	would best meet the identified critical
		the road is not built.		for more moderate storm events. However, as	success factors that had been established at
				Brent had gone through from the full most	the beginning of the project. This analysis
				conservative approach, there is the option for	investigated a range of alternatives to
				doing additional cost reduction savings.	provide a resilient corridor when considering more moderate storm events. As a result of
				So therefore, as part of detailed design outside	comments received on the Draft
				of this EIA process, there would be a risk	Environmental Statement, further analysis of
				assessment that can be done to look at the	a lower cost alternative will be completed
				lower profiles for example, for lesser storm	and provided in the Final Environmental
				events. So just because this is not set in stone,	Statement, along with other considerations
				but the EIA process took a worst-case	for potential cost reduction savings.
				conservative approach, but there are cost	
				reduction savings available to further	As part of the EIA process, it is prudent to
				investigate.	identify and assess the impacts associated
					with the version of the project that
					encompasses the full range of desired design
					options, including a highly resilient option
					against storms and then adjust it based on
					what is feasible and affordable. This ensures
					that the EIA will identify the "worst-case"
					scenario in terms of possible adverse effects,
					thus avoiding the need to carry out another
					EIA in the future should desired changes
					result in a larger project disturbance area.
					Establishing an estimated cost for the highly
					resilient option allows for a more informed
					decision-making process, whereas
					sustainability does not compromise
					economic viability.



V7	21 Jan	Question on the three-	Flooding/	No, you can design the road for any level of	The design criteria for the roadway will be
	2025	scenarios provided as far	Hydrology	resiliency that you would want to. Right now,	developed to align with the elevations of
		as the acceptable fit that		we have looked at and considered it, it is	both current and future land use, ensuring
		would reduce cost. Is it		included in the optioneering section of the	uniformity across the area. This approach
		safe to say that if the		report. But we have evaluated a 50-year storm	means that, similar to adjacent lands, the
		acceptable fit was		event, so we would not cause flooding to	roadway may also be vulnerable to flooding
		considered that we would		properties and allow natural drainage to occur.	during intense storm events. To mitigate this,
		not be able to mitigate		You could also do a 25-year storm event or a	the design includes the installation of cross
		flood risk, the road itself		10-year storm event. Each of them would	drainage stormwater pipes beneath the
		would actually flood, and		provide improved resiliency and each of those	roadway, to manage rainfall from less severe
		adjacent properties would		options could be designed and would be	storms. However, it is important to
		flood as well? Is that a fair		designed so they would not flood adjacent	acknowledge that in cases of more severe
		assumption?		property and water courses would still be able	storm events, which cause flooding in the
				to fully functional.	adjacent areas, the roadway may also
					experience flooding.
				What you have to think about is if you would	
				design for a 10 year event, it's just the	As part of the detailed design phase, the
				National Roads Authority that would end up	primary objective will be to best design a
				doing more maintenance, they would have to	resilient roadway that functions effectively
				clean the pipes more frequently in a storm	without causing adverse impacts on the
				event, they'd have to clean the brush more,	surrounding areas. This 'do no harm'
				possible repair damaged portions of the road,	approach ensures that while the road itself
				it would become resilient, it would take a little	may experience flooding similar to adjacent
				longer for it to be resilient after a major storm,	land at lower elevations, it will not
				but it would still improve resiliency. Normally	exacerbate flooding or negatively affect
				what would end up happening is a next step in	adjacent lands.
				the process, if it's decided to go forward with	
				the project, is that the National Roads	
				Authority or the sponsoring agency would do a	
				full risk analysis and look at the benefits and	
				the cost of providing different levels of	
				resiliency. Then they would decide what to	
				move forward with. Going with a 10-year	
				storm instead of a 50-year storm, you still	



#	Date	Comment Transcription	Торіс	Verbal Response Transcription	Supplemental Response
				wouldn't want to flood adjacent properties. You would still want to provide for natural flow of water, still want to be able to get water to and from the fragmented mangroves and whatnot. You can meet those needs in a number of different ways.	
V8	21 Jan 2025	You said that it would cost more money to maintain the road. Would some of those costs be included in that 40% to 60% reduction or is it going to cost more due to the NRA needing to maintain that scenario?	Maintenance Cost	With our cost estimates, we included the full cost of both construction and the life cycle maintenance. The life cycle maintenance addressed normal wear, tear and aging of the roadway, damage from vehicles and natural deterioration of the roadway features. This would include pavement resurfacing, maintaining lighting, sidewalks, barriers, and drainage etc. Damage due to flooding from more moderate storm events, such as washed- out portions of the roadway, clogged drainage pipes, washed-out drainage pipes or flood debris clearing could lead to additional maintenance cost.	See Section 6.2.1 Construction Cost and Appendix F.7: Construction Cost Estimates of the ES for more information related to the potential costs for the project.



#	Date	Comment Transcription	Торіс	Verbal Response Transcription	Supplemental Response
V9	21 Jan	Individual had a concern	Cost	In the example we provided that is the	See Section 6.2.1 Construction Cost and
	2025	why at three to five feet,	comparison	conservative scenario. That is assuming we	Section 6.3: Value Engineering and Future
		the cost would drop		make the whole corridor resilient to the 50-	Cost Reduction Considerations of the ES for
		significantly, why was it		year storm. As mentioned in the presentation,	more information related to timeline of
		not put in parallel with		at that level you need to have large structures	potential costs for the project and potential
		these numbers so that		[bridges], those makeup 50% of the	cost savings, including the use of a 25-year or
		people can see. Why was		construction cost. If you lower the road, it may	less design storm. The Final Environmental
		not comparative look at		be less resilient for the major storms, but the	Statement will provide further information
		costs to build this road.		price can come down because you do not need	on potential lower cost options that may be
				those large structures [bridges] anymore, you	preferred. Resiliency varies with the
				can use an alternate structure or event	elevation at which the road is constructed.
				culverts depending on the storm level that you	Roads built at lower elevations are more
				get. So, the price comes down significantly as a	susceptible to frequent inundation, whereas
				result of that.	those constructed at higher elevations
					experience significantly reduced exposure to
					such risks. Based on public comment and
					feedback, the EWA EIA Project Team is
					conducting additional analyses to adjust the
					Proposed Project profile design to
					accommodate Acceptable Fit criteria that will
					be defined and described within the Final
					Environmental Statement. The
					documentation will articulate how the
					Acceptable Fit conceptual design meets the
					established Critical Success Factors.



#	Date	<b>Comment Transcription</b>	Торіс	Verbal Response Transcription	Supplemental Response
V10	21 Jan	Individual asked two	Structures	To answer the first question, we did include an	Information on the proposed elevation of the
	2025	questions. 1. Out of the 8	over CMW	optioneering section of the report where we	new roadway and the inclusion of bridges are
		miles, how much of it will		identified the potential cost savings through	included within the Environmental
		be a pre-engineered		changing any of these factors. Then we	Statement. See Appendix F.10: Value
		concrete structure over		highlighted the potential changes you can	Engineering Options. An elevated causeway
		hanging a swamp? 2. How		make in the design in order to reduce costs.	or viaduct system was reviewed at a high-
		do I get to that swamp?		There are 14 total structures, 9 in section two.	level of conceptual design as part of the
				Another important thing to understand is that	Value Engineering options for the project.
				when you were laying out the road, we didn't	While this option may result in less
				have the advantage of having information, and	environmental impact, the cost to construct
				so it was always assumed that during detailed	the project in this manner was estimated to
				design additional calculations would be done	be significantly higher than the currently
				when there was more information along the	proposed project; and therefore, it was not
				alignment. That would be the opportunity to	advanced for further detailed study and
				change the openings, reduce and make those	consideration.
				modifications.	
V11	21 Jan	Individual cornered why	Data	We did have test pits data from 2005-2009	Test pit, subsurface profile information was
	2025	WRA was not given the	availability	from the Newlands Area, a part of the way out	provided for Section 2 of the EWA Extension
		appropriate information to		towards the quarries and there was a gap in	(dated 2008) and a portion of Section 3
		ensure this job gets done.		the test pits, so the area that there is a gap in	(dated 2014). These 2008 and 2014
				the test pits, some data would be needed	subsurface profiles do not encompass the
				there but we did have some of those test pits.	entire study area, and an extrapolation of
					data points was made for portions of the
					Proposed Project. Additional subsurface
					studies will be conducted as needed for the
					Proposed Project during detailed design.
					See Appendix E, Attachment E – Geo-
					Environmental – Assessment of
					Alternatives of the ES for additional
					information.



#	Date	<b>Comment Transcription</b>	Торіс	Verbal Response Transcription	Supplemental Response
V12	21 Jan	Individual asked why is	Cost	Section 2 has larger structures in it as well as it	See Appendix F.7: Construction Cost
	2025	Section 3 less than Section		includes the Will T Connector, which is about 3	Estimates for a more detailed breakdown of
		2?		miles of roadway. So collectively there's more	which materials were considered at this stage
				length of road for Section 2 because of the Will	of evaluation.
				T Connector.	
V13	21 Jan	Individual had a concern	Terminology/	Noted.	See Section 6.1.2 Bridge and Culvert Design
	2025	on the terminology being	Structures		Features of the ES for additional information
		used. Made a point that a		Those are just the bridge typical sections for	and figures of bridge typical sections for the
		lot of Caymanian's did not		the hydraulic openings to maintain	Proposed Project.
		understand what is		connectivity for storm surge. The underneath	
		happening based on the		will be open and free.	
		terminology being used.			
		Asked if the land is going			
		to be filled in or if it is			
		going to be a bridge like			
		an overpass.			
V14	21 Jan	Individual asked if the	Field visits	Yes, we have had people visit the sites. Two	As part of the EIA, field data collection efforts
	2025	panelist have visited these		field visits were conducted as part of the EIA	occurred in July of 2023 and May of 2024.
		sites and walked through		process. Sets of teams were going out and	
		some of the areas.		walking where we had availability to walk out	
				to and do additional ground truthing from the	
				available data that was provided to us.	
				Allowing us to look at the sections of the	
				corridors as well as the Will T Connector where	
				we had access and availability to be able to	
				walk that land to do additional ground truthing	
				for this EIA process.	



#	Date	Comment Transcription	Торіс	Verbal Response Transcription	Supplemental Response
V15	21 Jan	Individual asked if it is	B2 vs B3 /	It is not in our purview to make	See Chapter 5: Assessment of Alternatives
	2025	normal for the decision	Selection	determinations, that is not our role.	Analysis and Appendix E – Shortlist
		makers to ignore	Process		[Alternatives] Evaluation of the
		recommendations from			Environmental Statement for chronology and
		the Environmental			selection of the Proposed Project route. The
		Assessment Board on the			purpose of the EIA is to inform decision-
		shortlist options?			makers by presenting data and analysis for
					their consideration. The purpose of the EIA is
					not to make a recommendation. The final
					decision was made by Cabinet and not the
					NRA or the EAB. Neither the NRA nor the EAB
					can speak to why Cabinet selected B3 other
					than to say that Cabinet considered B3 was in
					the best interest of Grand Cayman.



V16	21 Jan	Individual asked why the	Cost /	If you look at the critical success factors one of	See Section 6.1.1: Roadway Features of the
	2025	cheapest option for	number of	the top factors was to build a resilient	ES for the potential progression of roadway
		building the road was not	lanes	roadway. When you are determining	features. This EIA process initially examined
		shown? Why was the		environmental impacts which you want to do	alternatives that would best meet the
		cheapest option not		so that you do not have to keep going back to	identified critical success factors that had
		considered, and all the		the tills, you want to determine the what the	been established at the beginning of the
		bells and whistles were		maximum impacts would be. In this case it was	project. This analysis investigated a range of
		added. How cheap can you		determined to evaluate it with a 50-year storm	alternatives to provide a resilient corridor
		build this road for?		based on hydraulic analysis that were done.	when considering more moderate storm
				They modeled a number of different storms	events. As a result of comments received on
		Concerned about the		events, and it was done by others. And this	the Draft Environmental Statement, further
		single carriage way, no		was the storm event that was determined we	analysis of a lower cost alternative will be
		better than what they		would do the modeling for. That is how we	completed and provided in the Final
		have now. Why not		started at the high end, we go to the low end.	Environmental Statement, along with other
		consider a dual carriage			considerations for potential cost reduction
		way.		So traditionally what will happen is the next	savings.
				steps of the process, if the EIA goes forward, is	
		Why does the road goes to		that the NRA will do a risk analysis and they	As part of the EIA process, it is prudent to
		East End and does not		will determine what, using design calculations	identify and assess the impacts associated
		stop at Frank Sounds.		with much more specific information, what the	with the version of the project that
				appropriate road would be to design.	encompasses the full range of desired design options, including a highly resilient option
				As far as both lanes, we went back and forth	against storms and then adjust it based on
				with the NRA on different means and methods	what is feasible and affordable. This ensures
				of construction. What would be the most	that the EIA will identify the "worst-case"
				effective way to build the project, but that will	scenario in terms of possible adverse effects.
				be done during detailed design when more	thus avoiding the need to carry out another
				information is together. During the design of	EIA in the future should desired changes
				the final document, we can be more specific	result in a larger project disturbance area.
				and provide different cost ratios.	Establishing an estimated cost for the highly
					resilient option allows for a more informed
					decision-making process, whereas
					sustainability does not compromise
					economic viability.



#	Date	<b>Comment Transcription</b>	Торіс	Verbal Response Transcription	Supplemental Response
V17	21 Jan 2025	Individual had a concern about the solar panel and revised it be changed.	Solar	Comment was noted.	Noted. The solar array is an optional feature of the corridor and outside the ambit of the NRA to implement. A re-evaluation of the solar array and benefits would occur by the implementing agency prior to design/construction.
V18	21 Jan 2025	Individual brough up the concern of carpooling and asked if an extra lane could be considered.	Carpooling	Something like that can be considered. It would be considered travel demand management.	No supplemental response.
V19	21 Jan 2025	Individual was concerned with the height of the storm surge. Also asked how high was the storm surge that was considered?	Storm surge / hydrology	There are other factors that go into it as well. For structure designs there has to be a certain clearance underneath the structure. Say your structure is 2 maybe 2.5 feet deep, we need to have some clearance underneath the structure so that debris does not build up. There are areas where the road has to be higher to accommodate that. So you have a 2 foot for structure debt but there is also a 3 foot clear freeboard they call it, so that is a clearance from the top of the water level to the bottom of the bridge so that debris cannot build up under the structure.	A Coastal Risk Study was completed for the Proposed Project by Baird and Associates in 2024. Flooding due to tropical storms and hurricanes, including the effects of tide, storm surge, waves, and rainfall, were numerically modelled to inform the corridor design. A summary of the study can be found in Section 12.3.5 - Coastal Storm Surge and Wave Overtopping Analyses of the Draft ES and the full study can be found in Appendix J.6 - Cayman EWA Extension, Flood Modelling and Roadway Drainage Openings – Final Report - Baird of the Draft ES.

