

**Transcript of  
PUBLIC FORUM ON GERALDS TEMPORARY AIRSTRIP  
Broadcast live on Radio ZJB  
Wednesday, January 30, 2002, Brades Pentecostal Church**

**Programme**

1. PRAYER
  - Peter Buffonge, Preacher
2. OPENING & INTRODUCTORY REMARKS
  - Alric Taylor, Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Communications & Works
3. OVERVIEW OF PROJECT & FORUM
  - Claude E. S. Hogan, GoM Airstrip Project Manager/Forum Facilitator
4. SUPPORTING INPUTS
  - Stephen Young (DFID-M) – Engineering & Safety Support Details
  - Stephen O'Driscoll – Management Dynamics & the Implementation Process
  - Dave Dolan – Drainage & Hydrological Issues
  - Michael Barnard – Communications Issues
  - Claude Hogan (GoM) – Socio-Economic Climate & Dimensions
5. POWERPOINT PRESENTATION
  - Bill Millington, Director, Halcrow Group

**PRAYER**

Pastor Buffonge: Gracious Father and our God, as we come before your presence again tonight, we always count it a privilege that we can come boldly to your throne of Grace. Father as we go in to this discussion tonight we ask for your guidance for you said that in all our ways that we should acknowledge you God and you would give direction. So Father as we go in to this session tonight we ask God that you will give direction in these decision-making in the name of Jesus. We give you thanks and we give you praise. Amen.

C. Hogan: Thank you very much Pastor Buffonge.

Your Excellency; Permanent Secretary, Alric Taylor; Sir Howard, DFID Head; Deputy Commissioner of Police; other distinguished ladies and gentlemen, a very pleasant evening to you. And please forgive me—honorable Speaker and his wife—sorry I did not see you there for a moment, sir. May I however continue?

Having regard for the length of discussion that we are supposed to have tonight. We have a very tight program. Everything about this airport project seems to be on a tight schedule but we have five gentlemen, including myself, and we'll be prepared to go through this program with you tonight.

But before we do that we wanted to be able to set the framework for these discussions and I'm very honored to invite one of our project officers for this project – We have two project officers responsible for this project. They are DFID, the Department for International Development-Montserrat, London-Montserrat and locally from the Government of Montserrat side—the other project officer is Mr. Alric Taylor, the Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Communications and Works.

Without any further ado, may I ask you to please help me to welcome the Permanent Secretary to set the tone for the discussions? Permanent Secretary. *(Applause)*

### **OPENING & INTRODUCTORY REMARKS**

A. Taylor:

Thank you very much Mr. Chairman. Your Excellency, the Governor; Honorable Speaker of the House; Sir Howard; members of the Halcrow team; distinguished ladies and gentlemen, good evening.

The Ministry of Communications & Works in association with the airport design consultants have organized this forum tonight as part of our public information strategy to inform the public on the proposed airstrip at Gerald's and indeed to provide an opportunity for interaction on key issues and concerns allied to the proposed facility.

The Government of Montserrat has already taken a decision to construct a temporary airstrip at Gerald's. Whatever "temporary" is defined to mean, the provision of this facility is important for several reasons among which are: economic and investment opportunities and also for the social and financial gains which could arise from this. In fact, it is my view that this facility could be the engine for redevelopment of Montserrat.

Despite the perceived limitations, as a people we need to look for the opportunities for maximizing the use of this facility. There have been several schools of thought, which posit that an airstrip at Gerald's is not safe and neither will it offer opportunities for expansion in the future. Alternate sites have been identified by interested parties but the view of the experts is that these alternatives do not satisfy the requirements or they could cause considerable disruption to wider sections of the public if they were to be implemented at this time.

It is my understanding that contrary to the views that abound on operational safety of an airstrip at Gerald's there are other airports in the region where conditions are worse than those at Gerald's and the records reveal few, if any, accidents. However, this is not to underestimate the need to ensure that the operation of an airstrip at Gerald's is safe.

Closely allied to safety is the need for improved security as a result of the September 11<sup>th</sup> events. Montserrat needs a safe airstrip where persons who have decided to travel by air transportation can feel safe and less anxious when they travel into and out of Montserrat.

As I understand it, risks are part of an airport's operations but more often than not, these are seemingly linked with the decision-making capabilities of the operators using the facility. However, every effort must therefore be undertaken to ensure that the infrastructure is not a contributory factor to increased risks.

Siting an airport at Gerald's has other implications too: relocation, land issues, access to other areas, housing, noise pollution, etc. and Government is mindful of these and a Steering Group comprised of members from key government departments has been set up to deal with these matters. I have no doubt that the requisite actions would be taken.

Tonight's event then is an important one that seeks to take this project forward. And the pleasure is mine to extend a very warm welcome to all of you who have taken time out to be a part of this important exercise. I wish to extend a very warm welcome to the Halcrow team. Members of this team are not new to our shores in that they were associated with the previous project to realign Bramble's Airport.

Let this then be an interactive evening where we could discuss the issues in an honest—indeed, we're in the Church—frank and cordial manner. Once again, welcome to all of you. *(Applause)*

## OVERVIEW OF PROJECT & FORUM

C. Hogan:

Thank you very much, Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Communications & Works, Mr. Alric Taylor. And as you might have gathered over the past few months, the Ministry of Communications and Works is the client Ministry for the proposed airport at Gerald's.

Ladies and gentlemen, I have spoken several times in respect of the airport project as sort of the lead person as Project Manager for a number of issues, some of which, the Permanent Secretary has raised. We are indeed, I think somewhat fortunate in so far as we can tonight sit here and give consideration to the future of our island and our own personal development as it may or may not be enhanced by an airport at Gerald's.

But what is very clear to me as the Project Manager is that we have but two choices at the moment given the time and place and situation in which we find ourselves. Those two choices are: to have an airport or not to have an airport.

And then we have other wishes. We might wish to have an airport but we'd like to have the airport fashioned and designed to meet the needs and aspirations which we have set for ourselves. We had an airport and we had dreams of a Bramble expanded and extended and reoriented to meet our economic and social demands and our demands to have—our hopes to have more tourists, more investors, more businessmen. Unfortunately, some of those hopes were dashed when in 1995 the events of Soufrière Hills Volcano were visited upon us. And we have had to relocate to north Montserrat, then a sparse, barren hinterland where very few people had dreams of retiring in glory and sunshine.

But today, this is the place; this is the time in which we find ourselves, really – making this part of north Montserrat the most habitable. And I'm encouraged because I find that even nature looks like it's on our side because I remember when I was young and coming to the north it used to look really dry and I wondered about vegetation and the environmental impact and what about the Silver Hills? Why were they so barren? But you realize since we came over here the whole place turned green. (*Laughter*) Anybody observed that? I observed the whole place turned green so I'm very encouraged.

But back to the question of to have or not to have—In that context of where we have come from and where we find ourselves—and it has been established by researchers in political science, etc. that once you have developed to a certain level it is rather impossible to reverse that impetus in your mind. And your whole being, your whole spirit is motivated to move from where you were to where you want it to be. And we have gone through a reverse cycle. Indeed sometimes I wonder if we don't need more than four psychologists. I might need two for myself.

But the reality is how do you adjust to a situation where psychologically you are motivated to go from where you are in your mind to a new reality where you have benefactors who can say to you (legally so) that I am required to give you so much resources to satisfy so much of your needs over so much of a period of your time and really, at the end of the day, the choice is yours as to how you make it? Whether you're going to creep before you walk or you're going to start to walk before you even creep because really that is the situation we find ourselves.

So how do we answer the question to have or not to have? It's an impossible question to answer. So I think the Government of Montserrat has done the really credible, bold thing of progressing on a path of attempting to resolve for the people of Montserrat some form of an approach to a destiny which we have already fixed in our minds.

So the struggle is to really define and design and come up with what ultimately are our needs in this situation. What is affordable in this situation? And how can we take best advantage of those resources which have been given to us in this situation? So really we are becoming, I

think, a more self-determined people. But it's a tough challenge and we continue as a people to knock on doors to seek assistance, to do as the Agriculture Department say, to grow our own and get involved in import substitution as we try to make our own lives while, of course, there are all of these other factors which we need to take into consideration.

The Honorable Chief Minister of Montserrat—I think he—Dr. John Osborne, that is—He said it in a simple way when we were in London the other day. A people on welfare could only get poor or poorer because welfare is a trap and the trap of welfare is that when you get on it, you lose your inclination to want to work and you lose a lot of your self-respect. And you lose your desire to live as a man. And this is the question of whether we want to wait upon the Lord or we'll help ourselves while the Lord helps us.

And this is the context in which I present to you tonight, the next stage of the implementation of an airport project for Montserrat which offers us the opportunity right now to be busy, to remain busy, to not lose sight of the fact that we have to work to keep practicing to work, to keep your brain in tune with the idea that you are in a situation and you have to keep working yourself out of it and there are not going to be any miracles about getting out of the situation in Montserrat, but work.

And right now I know how the international community system works. I understand that when you engage them it is not very easy to disengage. So we have to work through the process where the United Kingdom Government and the European Union Government have acceded to our request to finance what we call a temporary airport and I will not seek to define it at this time. But it has its limitations but it has its advantages.

So might I invite you now to recognize that the Government has taken a decision to move forward with the implementation of an airport at Gerald's? And in that regard, we have contracted the Halcrow Group. They are no strangers to Montserrat. They have worked at the Bramble's Airport. They have a long history of being involved in airport construction—50 years of it I understand. They have built airports in St. Vincent and the Grenadines, in Nevis. They are currently working in Dominica, Melville Hall. And they were the ones who were commissioned at the time—just before '95 to extend and reorientate the Bramble Airport.

So in a way, we have a set of people on a team who are – who have been involved not only in airport but they have regional and local experience. I have every confidence in their expertise. And tonight, they'll take you through the final design stage of what is proposed to be the Gerald's Airport or Airstrip Complex. And they'll try to guide you along as to how they'll be proceeding taking into consideration wind and safety studies, turbulence, modeling—a number of issues.

But I think I've spoken enough and I think you now have your thinking caps on and listen with a keen ear.

Ladies and gentlemen, we have from the Department for International Development-Montserrat Office, Mr. Stephen Young, an engineer assigned specifically to the Montserrat project. And Stephen will quite soon introduce himself so you can hear how his voice sounds otherwise than on radio.

On my immediate left is Mr. Bill Millington. He's the Halcrow Project Director, team leader for the Montserrat group. He has a long and distinguished tour of duty in the Caribbean, as I said, including Dominica, St. Lucia, Nevis, St. Vincent.

The Project Manager from the Halcrow side is Mr. Stephen O'Driscoll. He's also an engineer. He possesses exceptional coordinating skills as far as I'm able to discern and he has a depth of knowledge in air transportation issues, which is his area of specialization.

Mr. Dave Dolan, the gentleman with the gray hair in the nice light green suit is the drainage and hydrological engineering specialist for the project. His main job is to ensure that full account is taken of the drainage base in the Gerald's area in such a way that the strip is not compromised in the immediate or medium term.

Michael Barnard is a – I call him the old veteran—man of great wisdom in—I think it's (*indecipherable*) airports and nav aids and communications so you'll want to hear from him tonight. That's his business. He specializes in equipping commercial airport control towers with the optimum range of equipment to ensure safe and effective communications between the air operators and traffic control. He also provides expert guidance on the other communications systems which must be present at any licensed airport.

Those are our panelists. But to bring you to the heart of the matter, we are going to have a keynote, PowerPoint presentation from Bill Millington. But I just wanted you to get a feel of the team by having them introduce themselves and say a little word. I'll start with Stephen.

S. O'Driscoll: Thank you very much Claude for those introductions. Good evening ladies and gentlemen. It's a pleasure to be here on the island with you this week. As Claude said my name is Stephen O'Driscoll and I'll be the Halcrow Project Manager for the Gerald's Airstrip Project. I guess I'm effectively Claude's equivalent on the consultant's side. And my responsibility will be for the overall delivery of the project and to ensure that the key project objectives—the delivery of a safe and affordable airstrip at Gerald's is actually achieved.

Bill, I think, will talk in more detail about the programming issues but the target delivery date for this project is December 2003, which, in effect, condenses our consultancy commission into quite a short space of time. So my role will be to make sure that all the various components of the work are drawn together and the appropriate conclusions are drawn and taken forward. I'll pass you on to David.

D. Dolan: Good evening ladies and gentlemen. I'm David Dolan. My responsibility will be the drainage design of the airport and I too am pleased to be here. I'm not sure that I can have much answers at the moment.

M. Barnard: Good evening ladies and gentlemen. My name is Michael Barnard. I am supposedly the expert in communications, radio and telephonic navigation aids, meteorological systems and also on airport ground lighting.

S. Young: Yes. Good night ladies and gentlemen, distinguished guests. My name is Stephen Young from the DFID office here on Montserrat. I'm pleased to be here tonight and to represent DFID here. I think and I hope that by doing so I demonstrate DFID's commitment and support to the government of Montserrat in progressing this project, which we believe is vital to the sustained recovery of the island.

The brief that we've given Halcrow is to design an airport in accordance with international standards. Those international standards, which are the regulators' methodology to make sure that any airport that we build is entirely safe in operation. Also those regulations ensure that we will then be able to license operators to come in and out of there providing the commercial links to the island that we need to let us get away from the presently heavily subsidized transport services and to move forward.

We will need that airport to be in place as quickly as possible. We need it to be constructed in accordance with the available finance. We need to ensure that environmental and social considerations are fully addressed in the way that the project is conceived and then implemented.

My role really is to work with the Project Manager, the Honorable Hogan, to ensure that the consultants are working in accordance with their brief, that they are meeting those requirements we set for them and also to ensure that there's the timely release of the necessary funds to allow the project to go forward. So I am very pleased to be here tonight and as far as I can, I'll be pleased to answer any questions as we go through. Thank you.

C. Hogan: Thank you very much Stephen. And folks, I'm just to tell you that timely release of money is good. We have some money from the DFID people already so we are front loaded and ready to roll. And just to get you thinking and get Bill a little less anxious, Bill will be presenting us with a PowerPoint presentation and he'll be basically discussing where we are and where we are going. Bill Millington, May I ask you to please address the Montserrat public? Please help me to welcome Bill. (*Applause*)

### **POWERPOINT PRESENTATION**

B. Millington: Thank you. Good evening ladies and gentlemen, distinguished guests. I thank Claude for alerting my audience to my state of anxiety this evening. In fact, those of you who joined a little late probably missed his reference to his vision of northern Montserrat turning green over the last five years, which reminded me that I felt that I turned a distinctly whiter shade of pale at being informed that only two days into our first visit, we'd be making this public presentation. So I think we deserve some prizes for bravery.

But in fact we are very well prepared for this situation because over the last—probably eight months, this process of selection of my company and its team has been quite a rigorous one. It was by no accident that we find ourselves here. And indeed I personally was here, as was mentioned, back in '95 when I lead the team, which engineered the realignment of Bramble Airport before, of course, the circumstances brought the early closure of that project.

The firm, in fact, is no stranger to the Caribbean or island airport projects. The last few years, we've completed the project at Nevis for the runway strengthening and lengthening, which is obviously is extremely local and relevant. We've—currently, we're helping the Government of Dominica to establish a sensible strategy for the development of its two-airport system and to steer the Government away from concept of massive airports, which are unaffordable and unwanted, towards a more sustainable and affordable development.

But further away from these islands we are actually completing a project on the island of (*indecipherable*) in the northwest islands of our own British isles, which poses similar challenges to this project here in that it is difficult to make a fully commercial case for projects—airport projects such as this but there are other factors which determine the need for these projects. And indeed that project is looking good and it will be a lifeline to—not just the islanders—but the economy, the tourism on the island and the west coast of Scotland.

But I'm reminded of a project where a different decision was made and to the detriment of the community. And that is on the island of St. Helena where some years ago we were asked to look at the potential for the establishment of an airport on an island, which never actually had an airstrip. And, in fact, I think I'm right in saying—by whatever definition, it is one of the most isolated communities on earth.

And to this day, the population is still struggling to and there is an exodus and degradation of the economic base of the island simply because accessibility to the island is so poor and that the bull was not taken by the horns and a decision made to develop air services.

Still, let's not draw too many comparisons because the situation here on Montserrat is unique in many ways. And perhaps rather than dwell too much on history, I'll come more to the point, which is to describe the process by which we propose to bring this quite fast-track design and development process to a speedy conclusion.

In fact, when we look at the program actually there's hardly time to breathe. It's an extremely fast-track program. We're here today having only been commissioned, in fact, on the— in the first week of January. So we on our team, who are usually deployed in much less pleasant parts of the world, I must say, have converged here to make a rapid start to the project.

And in fact last week our geo-technical engineer, Mike Palmer who some of you probably met was here even before we'd dotted the "i"s and crossed the "t"s on our own contract with DFID. So we are ourselves extremely enthusiastic and willing to help Government of Montserrat complete this project in what—by any stretch of the imagination—would be a very ambitious program.

That isn't to say though that there are some serious obligations upon a design team to satisfy all of the statutory requirements necessary, especially in an environment where, as was referred to, the spotlight actually of some of the regulatory authorities will be on this project. The events that occurred in New York in September have meant that there is additional, shall we say, attention being paid obviously to security.

But as if that wasn't sufficient enough reason, this year actually probably will be—don't quote me on this—but one of the first, if not the first international airport to be built after those events. So the authorities not just the Government of Montserrat themselves, which has the ultimate responsibility but also other agencies such as the International Civil Aviation Organization, the International Air Transport Association, the Department of Civil Aviation in Antigua—they will all be working doubly hard to make sure that there are no shocks and surprises when these plans are put together, that they're adoptable, that they're fully endorsable and safe from a security point of view.

And further more, there have been some other changes in the regulations, international regulations. We are very lucky in the world of airports in that we do enjoy a set of standard international regulations throughout and across the world, which help our cause. But there have been improvements in the regulations, sharpening of those regulations, which now we're having to bring into force on existing and new projects—to some extent, makes our job easier because we are starting from scratch. But we've had discussions with the regulatory and licensing authorities to make sure they're prepared for new sets of regulations, which are even tougher than those which exist.

And having traveled around the Caribbean, of course, I'll not dwell on this point, but you're all aware of the situation at some of the other airports, Canefield (I'm traveling to tomorrow actually) you know, we all hold our breath and cross our fingers when we are coming into some of those airports. And when we look at the situation there, there is room for dramatic improvement in standards.

We feel that here at Gerald's, we have the opportunity, having being given actually a very good site to start from to get things right from the beginning and to actually improve upon—significantly improve upon the standards for even better airstrips in the region.

So I shall now describe the process, which is effectively a technical process. I'll be leading a team of engineers, architects, environmentalists, planners in bringing this project to a healthy conclusion in a fairly tight program. And if you'll bear with me, I'll—in fact, I'll just move over here—If I can grapple with the technology. This is the bit where I sort of turn white actually.

That's Stephen Young here whose knowledge of the engineering factors and the operational factors through his involvement in the project over the last year or two is obviously of enormous value to a project team which is really starting on this project, technically at least, from scratch.

On my side, the Halcrow side, myself—I have 25 years of experience, 26 years of experience in this area of airport planning and design, more or less, throughout the world.

Stephen O’Driscoll, our Project Manager who has some 15 years of experience in this area, has learned his trade in Australia, has been involved in the work we are undertaking in Dominica at the moment.

Roy Marsden who is visiting in three weeks time whose task it will be to determine precisely and to pinpoint aspects of the operational layout, operational aspects and layout of the airport including runway length, aircraft operating procedures, air traffic control procedures, aerodrome classification, and aspects relating to the regulatory process.

Mike Barnard whose job it will be to determine the air traffic control and communications requirements for the project, the lighting, navigational facilities, precision approach path indicators, other avionics systems as we call them—all of the special systems that go with an international airport to ensure safe operating procedures.

Dave Dolan, our drainage specialist. The site itself is on a watershed. There are some significant drainage issues to be dealt with on that site, not simply from the point of view of moving water from the watershed to the east and west when the construction of the strip is completed but also dealing with runoff and erosion from the project embankments off of the runway apron system into the drainage gullies. It’s an area of engineering, which is quite significant.

Mike Palmer has been here last week. We considered that the geological aspects of this project could be very critical to its viability. Although some investigatory work had been done earlier, work that we’ve done in ’95 at Bramble demonstrated that there was a possibility that large boulders could exist not far beneath the surface of the site at Gerald’s, in fact, anywhere on the island and that itself could create problems and raise costs and might push the project beyond the limits of affordability.

Not only that, there is the question of how to deal with the compaction of material in order to ensure a long lifespan of the project itself. Early results from the trial pits undertaken last week are very promising. And it looks as if we’re not going to have too many serious problems from the geotechnical point of view.

In three weeks time our environmentalist will be visiting the island. The environmental and social issues have been stressed as being of significant importance to this project. We may only be talking about a handful of movements a day at the outset, but nonetheless, this is a new international airport. Those operations may in fact be quieter than current helicopter operations but there is still a responsibility on the design team, the Government of Montserrat to fully explain what the environmental impacts, in terms of noise and other construction-related impacts actually are.

And last but not least, Ken Cassell, our local associate. Ken worked with us on the previous project at Bramble. And Ken will be responsible for architectural aspects of the project once it’s been determined what will happen to the terminal building, which was built as a temporary structure for the helicopter operation and the air traffic control tower.

Now the objectives: We mustn’t lose sight of the fact, as I mentioned earlier, that this actually is a full international airport, not just a new facility but a facility that must comply with all of the standards and regulations laid down by the International Civil Aviation Organization and that process of planning and designing an airport to meet international standards is a complex one even for a relatively small facility.

The objective of the project, of course, is to facilitate fixed-wing operations of Dash, Twin-Otter types and similar.

During the construction, the helicopter operation would continue and in fact special provision must be made in the planning of the works to ensure that that operation can continue safely whilst the contractor is moving tens of thousands of cubic meters of material and other major construction works.

The objective is, of course, that ultimately the project must be licensed by the licensing authority, which is a responsibility delegated to the Department of Civil Aviation. That the DCA of course are members or shall we say are subscribers to ICAO—follow ICAO regulations and that the standards that we will plan and design the airport to will comply with ICAO standards in accordance with DCA licensing procedures.

Now, it is also imperative that the aircraft procedures which are designed—and this is also part of the remit—are fully safe. Now, that is a complex process that involves the determination of aircraft procedures which provide operations in terrain, which in the vicinity of Montserrat is rugged, that therefore clearances on aircraft approaches all satisfy international requirements, that the utilization of the airport in terms of crosswind components fully complies with international requirements and that, therefore, from all points of view, the aircraft operation is deemed to be safe, in accordance with ICAO and other related agencies regulations.

But as I said that the helicopter service will be maintained during and potentially after construction. And that the project itself is compatible with surrounding and adjacent land uses. Proposals were afoot and I think are still anticipated for the construction of a cricket pitch adjacent to the project. It's important that when we are planning and designing the facility that this airport is fully compatible from all points of view in terms of line level, accessibility, generally, compatibility with other land uses.

That the environmental impact is being fully explained, analyzed and the proposals are in place for the mitigation of any adverse environmental impacts and similarly social impact considerations, that being resettlement and other disruption either during construction or as a result of the permanent works.

Not least, that the project itself comes in within budget. A budget of \$EC41 million is the prescribed budget for the work currently envisaged. It is the design team's responsibility, absolutely, to ensure that that estimate is kept within and that must include contingencies. That must provide of course for all of the engineering findings that take place over the next few weeks and that it is an absolute that that cost estimate not be exceeded.

And that an effective dialogue is maintained between the team, Government of Montserrat and the major stakeholders and the public. The major stakeholders in this project, of course, will include not just the government but airlines, other operators, the community and other users.

That there should be a benefit to the local economy from the project and a transfer of skills during the project design and construction and that also as I'll mention later that there should be a maximization that the potential for the use of local labor and materials on the project itself.

Now the program, as I said, is extremely tight. I must say that when we first saw this program, it was something of a shock to us. Although the project itself is not rocket science, it is nonetheless an important and strategic facility. As I've mentioned, it must comply with international standards and it's very tight.

The advantage is that a lot of good work has been done up until this point. There is nothing in the work that we've seen to raise major concerns or doubts over the recommendations made. We feel we are starting on a good foundation and that was advantageous to us in our response to DFID that we could achieve this program. Otherwise, I think starting from scratch that would have been an extremely optimistic call.

The first phase of the project is effectively planning and design. Right at the front, a planning phase or a scoping phase. To begin with, investigations, firstly geotechnical investigations, which are now being completed, samples are currently being analyzed.

I'll talk later about some of the investigations that we're undertaking on meteorological aspects including wind and turbulence; studies which will confirm the runway length requirement for the operating parameters that we are looking at for the Twin Otter; and the normal planning studies that would take place for a project of this type, which is the specification, effectively, of the geometry of the airport, the location of the building and the separation of the various elements and the other parts of the infrastructure for the project.

Now, the first phase of that project having then reached its inception stage, would be completed within four months—from weeks 1-17 to complete at the end of May 2002. We have something like 10 weeks to complete the planning stage, which will basically nail down the project in terms of runway length, location, alignment and then a period of just 6 or 7 weeks to actually finalize the detailed design and specification.

So by the end of May, we will have completed Phase 1a, the detailed design. One and a half months or six weeks are allowed for the tender process. We would be expecting to be following international procurement regulations on this—or practices—on this project, which is effectively an open tender.

And we would expect to find ourselves by July 2002 in a position to be able to actually award the contract. Mobilization of the contract would start in August 2002

*(Break in tape)*

... specified in the tender documentation for completion in December 2003. Total duration of the project: 21 months.

Now running through those points in a little more detail:

The investigations and studies—we're here actually on a familiarization process but it is an intensive working visit. Work has already started on the geotechnical work, as I've said, not just geotechnical mapping but topographical mapping is being refined. The topographical survey using a digital ground modeling essentially for the optimization of the major earthworks on this contract is quite a critical part of this early process.

The runway length requirements will be determined through performance studies, through operators and through experts in organizations such as the Civil Aviation Authority who'll confirm our own studies on what the requirements are for runway length on a given set of sectors. Assumptions have to be made on what the likely sectors and destinations from Montserrat would be—principally, Antigua, of course, but other sectors may be examined.

And so the purpose of the operations and performance study is to determine exactly what the runway length requirements are at Gerald's for a set of operating conditions, payloads and sector lengths.

The climatological study is something which is about to take place. There has been talk I know of concern over turbulence. There are two aspects to this: Firstly, crosswind. All

airport planning studies have to determine a crosswind component to enable the operator to be assured of a good utilization. At large airports where there are more than—there's a possibility of having more than one runway, crosswind is not a problem. On small airports, where only one runway is viable, the rules and regulations state that aircraft must be able to operate into that airstrip for no less than 95%, in this case, of the time.

Over three years of wind records currently are available and many more years of wind data through Antigua and Blackburne demonstrate over 98% utilization, which gives us a lot of confidence in utilization.

However, further work has to be done in order to demonstrate that turbulence on the approach—particularly on the approach from the west, obviously, is not a problem. And what we are doing there is undertaking a modeling process, which is effectively a physical modeling process which will simulate a whole range of conditions using a visual technique—using smoke traces but also a mathematical output to enable us to present to the licensing authorities such evidence as they will need to enable them to be confident that the operation is safe or that the conditions which give rise to turbulence can be anticipated and notified to operators in order to completely reduce those risks to acceptable levels.

And environmental scoping study, which will start in three weeks time—our expert visiting would examine the key issues and plan the mitigation measures.

Into the inception design, the preliminary studies I've just described will enable us to start with confidence on the basis of the design which is effectively the airport master plan layout that would determine effectively, the classification of the airport, line level, runway length, so on and so forth. So we're building on those studies which we've undertaken in the first few weeks of this project to give us confidence in the final adopted design.

To begin with there's a need to assess the suitability of what's already there at Gerald's. The terminal and the tower are the two obvious examples. Some work will have to be done to determine whether or not they can stay where they are. They are not—certainly the building is not particularly portable but the construction of a new building is not going to be cheap and so that is a factor and a balancing act that will have to take place to determine whether the building can stay where it is in the context of the runway location or whether it will have to be moved and reconstructed. It is quite likely that whatever solution is adopted that the air traffic control tower will have to be moved.

There are other areas of infrastructure including the existing road, which will clearly have to be diverted and we are looking again for the optimum solution on the diversion of that road, whether it be to the east or to the west of the runway is yet to be determined.

This approval process will lead to planning application.

During this process, discussions will have to be held with the two funding authorities on what the procurement strategy will be. The procurement strategy being the process by which the works are tendered and awarded. Different funding authorities have different sets of rules and regulations; some are more pedantic than others. On the other hand, those that, shall we say, are less intensive and provide more freedom sometimes also give problems to us. So clarity will be sought on exactly what is the preferred procurement strategy for this project will be and how the different components of the project may be packaged and let either in one contract package, or in two or several.

That procurement strategy will also, of course, have to address the issue of the requirement for contractors to pay attention to maximization of local expertise in terms of construction and other skills.

During this process, it is highly likely that there will be a pre-qualification phase in which international and regional contractors will be asked to file their expressions of interest for parts or all of the components of this project. And those will be evaluated in line with the funders' requirements in order for the short list of contractors can be submitted for approval to the Government of Montserrat.

Cost estimates, of course, have to be built up throughout this design process. We certainly want to identify any early warnings of overruns. We've already started doing that with the geotechnical investigations but it's obviously vital that the Government is made aware of any fatal flaws in any of the assumptions made already, which might bring rise, give rise to major cost escalations.

Phase 1a continues with the preparation of a full environmental impact assessment and the addressing mitigation measures before we go into the detailed design process.

Now the detailed design process is what we, as a team, have all been trained for the last 20 odd years to effectively pour all of our attentions into. The planning phase is essential. It is there that things can go extremely wrong if that's not bolted down properly but the skills of engineers in terms of designing airport terminals, pavements and special systems are brought into full effect during the detailed design process.

And that design process will specify exactly the materials used, precisely, the geometric alignment of the facility—the runway, taxiway and apron, arrangements for services—utilities, power supply, the diversion of the road, security fencing, lighting and the many other associated aspects of the project.

Design and building approvals need to be sought through Government departments before the tender and tender evaluation process.

As I've mentioned, pre-qualified firms, if this is the procurement strategy that we follow—it is not uncommon for a project of this size could attract pre-qualifications if it was let as one—from 20, 25 companies. It would be impractical to invite 20 or 25 companies to bid for a project like this. In our view, it would and it is quite likely that we would expect something like 6 companies to be tendering for a project of this size. So we'd be inviting tenders from firms which meet all of the pre-qualification criteria for a job of this type, whether it be let in one package or several.

During that process, contractors are encouraged to—and will obviously have a great desire to visit the site, inspect it, determine what the risks are in pricing that tender, asking the consultant and the Government of Montserrat whatever questions they may have on some areas of the works that are perhaps not too clearly explained in tender documentation, so clarifications are required.

The whole process is one by which what is being aimed at is the securement of good tenders which haven taken on board all the risks and are tenders from companies which we can be confident would deliver an excellent finished product. Obviously, one is also looking for tenders from companies that are not inclined to submit low tenders in order to win the job and then make excessive claims having being appointed. And this is the process by which tenders are evaluated when received, negotiated and awarded.

Recommendation would then be made to the funders for the award of the contract or contracts. Following the award, contract documentation is finalized and as I've said, we expect that by July or August we would be in a position to actually award this contract for start on site in August 2002.

The consultant does— moving towards the conclusion of my presentation—Consultants responsibilities don't end with the completion of the design and the negotiation and award of the contract. During the entire construction period, Halcrow would have a representative, a resident engineer, assistant resident engineer, certification engineer present on site in order to make sure that the contractor is working in accordance with the specification and contract documentation.

One of the contractor's responsibilities is to follow the environmental mitigation plan. Resident engineer's responsibility is to approve the contractor's working methods and program; to implement, supervise and certify the work; submit regular progress reports to the funders, the Government; ensure that the EMP is fully implemented and of course as we are here to do today, to keep the public informed through periodic meetings as to exactly what's going on on-site, whether we are ahead of, behind, progress on budgets and what other concerns the public and the contractor and other agencies may have about the project. And ultimately to submit a maintenance and final project report before the process of final certification.

Once the process is physically complete, flight-testing is undertaken. That testing is—would be undertaken under the auspices of the DCA and the Government of Montserrat itself. The flight-testing process helps us to calibrate the equipment that's been installed on the airport and to, of course, absolutely confirm that the operation is safe and compliant with international requirements before the license is applied for and received.

Now that's a—as I said, perhaps a rather dry description of this planning and design process. It's something we do every day. It's something we've done at a number of airports of similar sizes throughout the world. We're very familiar with the territory and what the challenges are. But I do say that this is quite a unique situation for us given the circumstances in Montserrat and, of course, the desire for Montserratians here to travel to and from the island and of course, Montserratians abroad to access the island, perhaps to return to the island permanently.

So, in summary, this is where we—what we are about: early identification of what the priority issues are. As I've said, we've already moved in that direction with the geotechnical work; that we believe to be a priority issue; what the key stakeholder requirements are and the commercial imperatives.

Delivering within time and on budget is an absolute. This has been made very clear to us in our terms of reference. There is no contingency over and above the budget specified and it is our job to make sure that this project comes in on budget. Otherwise, we might be in a St. Helena situation and get nothing.

Efficient coordination of all design and study components is a natural part of the process for the study team. Coordination with the Government of Montserrat, the Antiguan DCA, agencies to whom the DCA consult, of course, which include the Federal Aviation Administration and the UK Civil Aviation Authority, the EU and DFID, the two principal funders.

Ensuring that operating procedures are absolutely safe, certifiable, compliant, have been tried and tested. As I said at the beginning, there are some additional pressures on us following the events of September and some sharpening up of the codes and recommendations in that respect.

And last but not least, to address and to control the environmental impact and the social impact brought about by this project.

So that is obviously a very, I would say, a very brief sketch of what we are going to be doing between now and July this year in terms of design and what, hopefully, should the project receive—which, obviously, we hope it will—what our responsibilities will be until January 2004 in completing and handing over the project.

So thank you very much for listening—for your patience in listening and look forward to any questions you may have at the end of this session. Thank you. (*Applause*)

### INTERACTIVE SEGMENT

C. Hogan: Thank you very much Mr. Bill Millington. And ladies and gentlemen, at this point, it is my pleasure to basically invite you to engage us in an interactive segment. And the forum will continue as follows. You may ask questions of the panel and I'll use my best judgment and ask one of the most competent of the experts to answer your question. We have five gentlemen in the significant areas that have been addressed and many of them will be able to embellish further some of the points made by Mr. Millington—which I found was quite informative and comprehensive. So I'm basically opening the floor to you and you can ask your questions from the center of the aisle there and we'll take your questions unless you are totally convinced. Or you prefer for me to ask the first question?

R. Tyson: Good evening. In your terms of reference, you're talking about a Twin Otter. Could you tell me what length of runway is required for a Twin Otter to comply to all the safety standards of an aborted flight if necessary?

B. Millington: It's a complex answer because it depends upon exactly what the operating parameters are for the aircraft. And another complexity for those who followed the saga to date is that suggestions have been made that the aircraft, the Twin Otter can operate in either STOL or conventional mode.

Now, part of our work in the first 10 weeks is to rigorously scrutinize the assumptions on operating parameters for the Twin Otter and other aircraft types. First of all to iron out the question of whether or not the aircraft is going to be permitted or whether indeed, it's even desirable for a Twin Otter to operate in STOL mode. I will say that the Civil Aviation Authority in the U.K. are not overly comfortable about STOL operations.

For those who perhaps are not aware STOL is Short-take-off and-landing, which was a method of operation brought about in Canada some 25 years ago and suited to a particular airport environment, suited also to a particular aircraft type at the time, a Dash-7.

The short answer to your question is that a detailed analysis of the runway length requirements for the Twin Otter in STOL and non-STOL mode is being undertaken, also to a range of destinations and a range of...

R. Tyson: You're not answering my question. The manual ...

B. Millington: Well, you asked me what the runway length requirement ...

R. Tyson: I asked you what distance is laid down in the manual that is required for a Twin Otter ...

B. Millington: The runway length?

R. Tyson: The runway length in STOL, the accelerated stop distance in an aborted flight and if you can't meet those requirements, will you still build an airport?

B. Millington: Well, if you mean an aborted takeoff, all runways are designed for an aborted takeoff. That is one of the rules of the game. We have to design a runway for what we call the accelerated stop distance.

R. Tyson: You design a runway to comply to the aircraft manual, surely.

B. Millington: Yes and the aircraft manual ...

R. Tyson: And the aircraft manuals say, you need 695 meters ...

B. Millington: At maximum range in take off ...

R. Tyson: So you'll be flying with half payload, half passengers?

B. Millington: No. We're flying to destinations or we would be but I don't want to pre-empt this analysis. We're looking at a range of payloads and range of, or certain range of situations and a range of operating circumstances for that aircraft.

And as I said, the complication that the aircraft can operate in STOL or conventional mode means that there is not one answer to the question of what the accelerated stop distance for the Twin Otter is. There are at least four different answers for that question. It very much depends upon exactly what the, shall we say, the route structure that we're offering is, whether we're flying to Antigua, only to Antigua, or whether we're looking at St. Martin, whether we're looking at Guadeloupe, whether we're looking at Nevis, which we obviously would, if we were looking at Antigua. But what we have to do is to look at a matrix of operating parameters in order to determine what a safe runway length is for a ...

R. Tyson: If you can't, if you could not get a 650 or 695 meters, which the manual categorically states—and I've got it here with all the graphs and the logs.

B. Millington: Yeah.

R. Tyson: I am a pilot. I'm not a commercial pilot. But the safety aspect of this airport concerns everybody on Montserrat.

B. Millington: Yes.

R. Tyson: If we're going to spend, or you're going to build an airport that will not be certified and licensed for a 19-seater Otter, and we end up with a 9-seater at a temporary airport for the next five years ...

B. Millington: I think if we ended up with a 9-seater operation, we do not have a project. That is a clear requirement of our terms of reference. Our terms of reference require us to determine what the runway length requirements would be for a Twin-Otter operating on a full passenger capacity, whether it's 17, 18, or 19.

R. Tyson: And when will you inform the people, when and what the distance will be? When will you be able to tell us?

B. Millington: Yes. Of course, we will.

R. Tyson: When?

- B. Millington: The study phase reports in May of this year and that study phase will determine the runway length and the inception report will explain what the operating parameters are which relate to the runway length that's been determined.
- In fact, it works the other way around. We have to determine operating parameters, which include: STOL, non-STOL; what the payload is; what the range of destinations are.
- We will then explain and we will provide in appendices of our report references to the watch charts and the other performance manuals, also confirmation from operators that the runway length requirement or the accelerated stop distance requirement and the landing distance requirement for the Twin Otter can all be achieved within the licensing and regulatory parameters specified by the DCA.
- R. Tyson: ICAO, in its report in July 2001, which actually condemns Gerald's because you cannot get a runway length of at least 600 meters.
- B. Millington: We are going to put the microscope on this whole question. I can't ...
- R. Tyson: You can't overrule ICAO, can you?
- B. Millington: I have not read the report so I'd rather not comment.
- R. Tyson: Well, this is a very, very important report because this is the International Civil Aviation working in conjunction with the Civil Aviation ...
- B. Millington: Is this Michael Vreedenburgh's report?
- R. Tyson: Yes.
- B. Millington: I'm sorry, I have read the report.
- R. Tyson: So you have read it?
- B. Millington: I have read the report but there are no appendices within that report that enable me to determine whether or not those remarks relate to an aircraft operating on whatever routes, sector it is operating. Michael Vreedenburgh's of ICAO's report also refers to this question of STOL or non-STOL operations ...
- R. Tyson: My main concern is that we lost 19 people with the volcano and I'd hate to think we could lose 19 people because somebody is not doing the safety standards that are required and laid down by Civil Aviation and ICAO. And, also the licensing of the aircraft, which is done by the Civil Aviation lays down categorically in the manual. Will you please ...
- B. Millington: I fully understand your concerns and I can assure everyone here today that the firm would not actually proceed to complete the design or submit a design nor would the DCA approve or license an operation which was unsafe for any airport-- aircraft operating whether it be the Twin Otter or any other type. These things are not treated lightly by the company but certainly by the licensing authorities and they are rigorously examined and will be in the first 10 weeks of our study.
- J. Romeo: Have there been any reports from helicopter operators about turbulence and wind shear on approach and departure? What would be the difference between the helicopter and a fixed-wing under these conditions?

B. Millington: Yeah. There have been reports, as I'm aware, of the likelihood of turbulence on approaches from the predominant approach to Gerald's, which is the approach from the west. The fact of the matter is that helicopters are less likely to register turbulence on approach than fixed-wing operations and therefore any reports of turbulence from helicopter operators need to be listened to. For that reason, the terms of reference of our study require us to undertake climatological studies, which as I explained determine or prove two things. One is that the runway is usable, in terms of cross wind and the other one is that turbulence is not considered to be unacceptably prevalent on approaches either from the east or the west, to be honest.

Now, turbulence isn't a licensing issue. If you talk to the licensing or regulatory organizations, crosswind is a licensing issue, but turbulence or and wind shear is not an issue through which an airport can be condemned or denied a license. What happens is that operators themselves have to have demonstrated to the licensing authority that they are capable of operating in circumstances where turbulence might occur.

So with all of these factors brought into account, we have put into place, wind modeling studies, which will demonstrate whether or not turbulence is a problem. Now, the aim of this modeling is not just to determine whether it's a problem but that if it determines that it is a problem that what procedures can we put in place to notify operators of the existence of conditions that might give rise to turbulence on the approach. For example, it's not easy to give an exact answer because the topography determines but it's quite possible to say when wind speeds exceed 13 knots from the north or northwest that is a situation that can give rise to turbulence and that therefore that can be notified to operators from Antigua and those operations can be amended to suit.

Now, the fact is that those conditions, 13-knot winds from the north never occur in Montserrat any way. So what we are trying to do over the next few weeks is to pre-determine the conditions which might give rise to turbulence to try to model and predict them ascertain how serious they are. And again, as in my response to the first question, the aim of the whole exercise is to prove absolutely that the operation is completely safe and licensable and operable. So we are leaving no stones unturned in that respect.

Major Lynch: Two questions really. The first is: on Montserrat, I was under the impression that for all major projects that environmental and social impact studies precede all major projects but it seems to me that these environmental and social studies will be carried out in the center of the project. If for instance, we find issues that cannot be mitigated, it means that the project could be aborted?

That's one and secondly from the answer to the gentleman's question with regards to the length of the airstrip that is required for a Twin Otter, you said they are investigating. Am I to understand therefore that if you do not or you cannot reach this particular length that the project again will be aborted? And what would happen to this money that was for Montserrat? Would it be wasted money, so to speak? *(Applause)*

S. Young: Firstly, I mean, where we are in the project and I think where Bill tried to bring out as he went through his presentation is that we are a fair way down a process at the moment. There have been a number of previous reports looking at a range of sites, as you know, looking at Gerald's itself. And indeed, the Italian Report by SEA started to address some of the environmental issues that were raised by Mr. Lynch there. So we're not coming at this afresh in that sense. There have already been assessments of the environmental impact, of the social impacts and indeed those have been important in getting us to the point where we are today. They are going to be addressed again by the consultants as they go through the process and that is an important part of their work and will be integral to the way they carry out their studies.

Talking about the concern about length, as we've said, the brief that has been given to Halcrow is to design an airstrip for the safe operation of Twin Otter aircraft with a full payload. That is the brief that they are required to work to and what they are going through

the process at the moment is to determine the runway length, the other characteristics of the runway that would be necessary to allow that to be achieved. That is their brief. That is what they must do and that is what our role is—is to oversee that and to ensure that comes through.

And those requirements are not something that Halcrow themselves will make up as they've said. They are all well-defined in international standards designed to ensure safe operation and in that way we can be confident that when they come forward with their recommendations, if they follow the correct standards, follow the correct procedures, that the airport will be judged to be safe in every normal way that that is prescribed.

And I think—talking about the money issue there, I mean the money has been designated for the airport project. I have every confidence that as we go forward, the preliminary work that has been done will be confirmed and we will be able to go forward with the project. I say, there has been already, as you know, quite a lot of work done already, indeed, a great deal of work done already. Halcrow have already said that as they've looked at that work, they found it to be sound work, reliable work on which they can build. And so those are the steps that we are going forward for. So I feel fairly confident. I feel confident. I shouldn't say fairly. I feel confident that we will be able to go forward down this path but that's not to prejudice. We must wait for the technical evaluations to come forward.

C. Hogan: In March of this year (while I wait for another question) we'll be getting what you call an inception report that we'll discuss with the consultants any preliminary findings and at that point, we'll move to the next level but certainly their terms of reference are strict in terms of designing the airport for a Twin Otter aircraft. Yes sir.

C. "King" Lee: History speaks for itself. I have the privilege of working with one Brett Carlson from ICAO back in the 70s, the Venezuelans in '78 and LIAT. And all condemned Geraldts. They even took the AVRO and do a flight path over the same area in Geraldts that Geraldts was disqualified. How come that Geraldts now is at the top of the list? And as Tyson said, the runway length is a key issue.

The other day I was watching Discovery Channel and to see a 737 fall out of the sky with 135 passengers because of wind shear and turbulence. The pilot was requesting what is his wind speed and gust. They were giving it to him and he increased the power by 25 knots more, still he fell out of the sky,

At Geraldts, we have hurricane winds that blow at Geraldts and those living at Geraldts, we have the experience here and to talk in the reports of 500 meters, 500 meters, 500 meters—the Twin Otter takes more than that because when I had to do the resurfacing of Blackburne Airport they required 2200 feet at all times out of 3000 feet. I had to make available 2200 feet for the Twin Otter to land full payload on takeoff.

I heard the opening statement from the gentleman talk about temporary airport and all of a sudden I heard him talk about international airport. How are we then to feel confident that we are moving along the right path, that we are in temporary and all of a sudden, we've gone into international? We have come of age and we need to know the truth and we need to know why we are being pushed at Geraldts when there are other areas in the country?

And as my friend Mr. Lynch just talked about the environmental impact, or the EIA, to develop an aerodrome it takes one year to five years to develop an aerodrome, why have we been carrying the cart before the horse of not carrying out the wind studies and all the necessary studies before we can just, brap, and throw it on Montserratians? Thank you.  
(Applause)

C. Hogan: Actually, I don't believe there's anybody competent I can turn the question to. So (laughter) that leaves me in the dilemma of having to hazard an answer because we are talking to

engineers, but I would like to try to because the concerns you raise are serious concerns and have serious political overtones. And that's why it's difficult for me to choose anybody to pass it to?

C. "King" Lee: I was trying to find the Venezuelan report but the volcano took it. I had the Venezuelan report and I had the Brett Carlson report; but the volcano took it. (*Laughter*)

C. Hogan: If I might try to answer you though, the question of "temporary" versus "international." International is not opposite to temporary. Temporary as we have defined it and I sought not to try not to define it tonight, but maybe I should because "international means"—and I'll ask him to speak further on that—I suspect that he was talking about the standards that the airports have to adhere to.

Temporary is a choice made by the Government of Montserrat in respect of what is affordable at this time given the resources that are available to us and the circumstances which present themselves to us and we find ourselves in a situation where we have to build a temporary airport not in the physical sense but in the sense that we cannot afford to build one that can give us the capacity or the length that we think we might need given our own aspirations of how we want to accelerate the development of the country.

The airport at Gerald's as I said and I think the consultant outlined that he has a budget of some—It's 41 point something—some people say 40 and some people say 42 but it's 41 point something million dollars that he is required ...

C. "King" Lee: 40 point something million now. It was 39 point something million before.

C. Hogan: 41 point something million—Some people say 40 some say 42 but in any case, he has to fix the length of the airport taking safety and everything into consideration to spend 41 million. If we can find additional resources, if they were available, then the airport could be longer but it's going to be a cost. In fact, I think they might give us an option of a longer airport at Gerald's but it's whether we'll be able to pay for it. Sorry Mr. Lewis.

Dr. Lewis: Good evening everyone. Can you all hear me? Good evening. I listened to the presentation—an excellent presentation. It was very clear. I think it actually gave us all the facts that we need to move forward and I've come up to the mike – I was hoping to take a back seat tonight but I think the mention that no one being competent to handle the question here makes it necessary for me to come forward because this is obviously the responsibility that we asked you the people of Montserrat to vote us for.

Having this forum is another expression of how we are prepared to come to you and share our views and let you understand why we are making decisions. And also to make sure that whatever we do is being done with the confidence and the support of all the people of Montserrat. Decisions are made; they are not all made necessarily along the lines that everybody wants them to be but you have to make judgments. In my business I make judgments about life and death all the time and I consider this issue in a similar vein.

Now to specifically answer your question, I mean most of you who have come up and ask the questions know what's being going on. I mean, I did give my colleagues fair warning that they were going to be in for a rough time. And I think you lived up to it and quite rightly so because this is a very important issue. As you know, we've only been at the job for less than a year and the bottom line is that the Governments before us let you, the people of Montserrat, down. From the very day the volcano started causing trouble, you should have had the ICAO in. You should have had wind studies, feasibility studies, geotechnical studies and a decision made.

We have come in 3 or 4 years down the road and we have a task. We have a task to deliver you an airport, a good airport as quickly as possible before the money runs out—a good and a safe airport. And what you would have heard tonight is that we are actually going to make damn sure that the airport is as we want it to be.

Now, in the acceptance of the Gerald's project, it was clearly stated of an airport that would accommodate a fully loaded Twin Otter and those are the terms of reference that the consultants have been given. It is public knowledge that there is always difference of opinions about certain things and we the Government made a decision based on two factors: what was reported as affordable and what was reported as possibly safe.

Even with the statements of the acceptance, it has always been said that it is subject to the results of tests. I mean the consultants have once again confirmed this tonight. They have stated quite clearly that if the criteria that they have been set are not fulfilled, that you don't have a project. They have actually said that.

In other words, we have been honest with you. And that is why, as you all know, I leave nothing to chance. And that is why, not necessarily getting full support, will encourage people to always make sure that you have an option because in my line of work, you always try to have an option even though you may not be able to deliver that option. And whether we like it or not, the fact is that the other potential sites have been defined or described by the experts that have looked at it as being unaffordable.

It has been admitted that there are several factors which question the accuracy of the reports because ...

*(Tape runs out)*

... which have taken place to date. For instance, most people agree that it would have been useful to have the wind studies, environmental impact studies and the geotechnical studies available before you actually chose a site but the decisions have been made because we have a feeling or the advice that it is likely that the results will confirm that we will have an airstrip that will be safe. And everything I've said has been documented and recorded. And I have made the point that the safety is of paramount importance and as I've said the consultants have again confirmed that tonight.

In referring to the question that Mr. Lee asked about how this has become an international airport. That again confirms that the airport is expected to be one that would say take a flight from Barbados to Montserrat. A Twin Otter can do that distance; similarly from St. Kitts, St. Martin to Montserrat. And it all comes down to what Mr. Hogan has described quite clearly as the fact that the viability of the project will be known at the end of March when the studies are available.

My great difficulty has been trying to get everybody to keep on board this idea of an option. And perhaps—I do have a question, which I will ask them later in private but I think that the important thing (*Audience requesting that he asks question publicly now*) the important thing is that the facts have been laid down here before you and as Mr. Stephen Young said, the indications are that the results might allow us to proceed but that, in fact, there is concern, even from the consultants, that the results of the studies might not allow us to proceed. Thank you.

C. Hogan:

Thank you Honorable Minister. I'm still available for your questions. Recognize the union leader. I think he's going to ask us about employment of workers on the project. I'm trying to hold the mike. I was just pre-empting you sir. The Union Leader, I thought you were going to ask us about the employment of workers.

H. Bramble: You will hear Mr. Hogan. Mr. Millington, I wouldn't put you on the line because when Mr. Hogan introduced you to me today I thought you were a reasonable person so my questions are more for Mr. Hogan than anything else.

Now we keep speaking about runway length, runway length, runway length and we're hearing all kinds of things about runway length, Mr. Hogan. And I'm going to repeat a question that you asked your learned counterpart, Nigel Harris, the other night. "How do you assess the operational potential of the proposed airstrip at Gerald's?" And he said, "Addressing the question that you asked me about the operational potential of the airport, the constraint obviously is the 500 meters."

Now you seem to be a person who loves to interpret words and I heard you mention tonight that the temporary airport has its restrictions. Are restrictions and constraints one and the same thing? That's my first question to you Mr. Hogan.

C. Hogan: That sounds like an engineer's question. (*Laughter*) Are you sure you want me to answer that?

H. Bramble: Yes, I want you to answer the question.

C. Hogan: What's the question again? (*Laughter*)

H. Bramble: Are restrictions and constraints one and the same thing?

C. Hogan: I didn't hear the first word, sorry.

H. Bramble: Restrictions.

C. Hogan: Oh, restrictions and constraints. In some circumstances, yes.

H. Bramble: Mr. Harris went on to say Mr. Hogan, "we have to be quite clear on that" speaking about the constraint the 500 meters obviously has. And he said, "having said that, there are aircraft more capable of operating into a 500-meter strip." And he went on to state that the Twin Otter, for example, will operate at maximum loads quite happily into a 500-meter strip. And he went on to talk about the Dornier but then he said, "certainly an Islander will operate into a 500-meter strip but not at maximum all out weight. So far charter services, for six people, possibly"—that's the underlying word—"possibly, an Islander could also come in." So the restriction is 500 meters. Mr. Hogan I don't know if you want to pass the question on but if we are going to have restrictions on a 500-meter strip for a 9-seater aircraft, how come now you are going to tell me that the Twin-Otter can land in conventional mode on a 500-foot runway, on a 500-meter runway?

C. Hogan: We don't have an operational expert tonight, as you realize but the point was also made by Nigel in that report that the conditions for landing are more onerous for a Trilander than they are for at Twin Otter because a Twin Otter is designed to land in very harsh conditions and on short runways so that, in fact, a 500 meter strip is too short for a Trilander. It doesn't depend on the size of the plane. It is the – somebody help me. Aerodynamics. You can help me Bill?

H. Bramble: Mr. Hogan I never said a Trilander; I said an Islander.

C. Hogan: Islander, yes; the same thing. (*Laughter*)

H. Bramble: An Islander and Trilander?

- C. Hogan: No. What I'm saying to you – what the pilot said is that the Islander would have more difficulty than a Twin Otter even though the Twin Otter is a larger plane—have more difficulty landing on a 500-meter strip because of the design of the plane. The aerodynamics of an Islander are different to those of a Twin Otter, which is designed for that purpose.
- H. Bramble: Let me move from that question Mr. Hogan because you are going to bite your tongue. You said that you can get up to 655 meters at Gerald's, up to, on that same program but the 41 point whatever million we are hearing about is for a 500-meter strip, how much more will it cost now to put in a 600-meter or the additional meters that you are speaking about? How much more will be added onto the 41 point odd million?
- C. Hogan: Well, in the terms of reference we drew up with the consultants following the meeting we had in London, we did in fact ask them to try to maximize the length of the strip. Since they have arrived here and looked at the terrain, they have said to us, it's doable but it's going to cost you.
- H. Bramble: How much more, Mr. Hogan?
- C. Hogan: Well that has to be quantified by the surveyors. We had to recall, remobilize the DTM surveyor that we had from London. He is coming on the 2<sup>nd</sup> of February. And he has to redo the surveys down to the ravines so that we can quantify costs.
- H. Bramble: So, bottom line Mr. Hogan is that Gerald's cost has gone up from 42 million. It's going up some place, but where? I'm glad you made mention to the terms of reference. And I know the Honorable Doc was not a part of your panel but since he is the Minister of Coms & Works, I'll throw it to both of you. Can the terms of reference that Halcrow is now working with be made available for public scrutiny and how soon? Some of us would like to see the terms of reference that Halcrow is working with.
- C. Hogan: We'll have to discuss the terms of reference, not with the ... Is it available Minister? I'll have to ask my project officers. I am not sure. (*Audience expressing disenchantment*)
- H. Bramble: And when you make them public, could you please send them to Bennette so that the Montserratians outside who read the newspaper online can see it?
- C. Hogan: Very well sir. We will see what we can do for you.
- H. Bramble: Mr. Hogan. It's you again Mr. Hogan because, you see, you bring this on yourself. You take a job that people going to give you some stick with Mr. Hogan. (*Laughter*)
- C. Hogan: I'm doing it for the people. I realize as I said before, Mr. Bramble that we have difficult decisions to make because we are in a difficult situation and I fear very much just like you that if I do nothing, nothing will happen for me.
- H. Bramble: Now, it was Mr. Billingham [Millington] who keep mentioning flight sectors, flight sectors and so forth but in the same ICAO report, the aircraft type, DH-C6-300, can I take it to mean that it is the Twin Otter? But it says clearly here on the flight sectors operating from Antigua, Guadeloupe, St. Martin that you are going to need an approximate runway length of 600 meters.
- C. Hogan: Yes. That's what Bill was trying to say that depending on where the flight is originating from, the length of the strip required would vary and that would be developed along— on a matrix so you'll know what the strip requirement is for a full payload for Antigua, for St. Kitts, for Nevis, for Guadeloupe or for those destinations that are chosen.

H. Bramble: My last question for you Mr. Hogan is that in that radio broadcast (I don't know when I'm going to catch you on the radio again so I am going to ask you them tonight) you mentioned that you have spoken to the people who will be affected at Gerald's, etc., etc. And tonight on my way here I heard Mr. Taylor say we are in the house of God or something like that and we should be truthful. Have you spoken to all the people involved Mr. Hogan that will have to relocate that is in the part of the strip? Have you spoken to everybody Mr. Hogan?

C. Hogan: Yes. I have.

H. Bramble: You have?

C. Hogan: Yes sir.

H. Bramble: May I ask you a question Mr. Hogan? What is the government offering-price per square foot for land for these people, which is my last question.

C. Hogan: We have not yet completed the land valuation but since you asked the question and it's in the public domain, I might outline the procedure for the land purchases because what we want to do is to have land purchases as opposed to land acquisition.

The procedure for purchasing the lands by treaty is that the people who live in the particular impact zones will have their own assessments made of the value of their land, property and any ancillary supplies or plants or goods or agricultural products on their land.

Our Government's Valuation Officer will also make a valuation based on prevailing market prices. There'll be a negotiation and they'll arrive at a settlement.

In addition to that as supervisor of the Compensation Subcommittee, we are required to consider the question of the injurious affection caused by us having to ask them to move. That is an additional amount for compensation to the residents.

The residents' situation for compensation—they vary. Some of those folks are very senior and fragile and we'll have to provide them with complete housing solutions.

What we are proposing to do and I have had preliminary discussions with the LDA is where we identify that someone needs a complete rebuild of a home for themselves and to house them, we'll put the financing into the LDA system and the LDA will discharge the housing solution according to the established rules and guidelines that are already established. But the financing will come from the project.

There are also some folks who think that they would just like to have their money and leave Montserrat for good. We think that they are just a little bit put off by the fact that we have to ask them to move. We are very sorry but I believe that they are doing a good service. They are making a sacrifice for Montserrat.

There are some people in the area who feel that they suffered injurious affection because of the helicopter because their windows and so on have been damaged by dust, etc. I'm sure that the Government of Montserrat will take all of those issues into consideration because what we want is for them to voluntarily move to assist the Government and people of Montserrat with a development program which has to be timely to prevent us from going into further erosion of the economy.

Yes sir.

B. Roach: I am left a little bit confused actually. A few weeks ago, you had said that we had gone beyond the requirements of studies-- wind studies, etc. to proceed with the airport. And my understanding then from what he had said is that it was a done deal, that we had gone beyond that and no longer will these inhibit or prevent the construction of the airport.

Tonight I am understanding that we are undertaking the design of the airport, pending to some extent, and one can correct me if I'm wrong but that's my understanding, pending to some extent, some of these studies. And I think Mr. Millington did say that, in fact, there is a point at which if they are unable—if these studies and as they go on, they are unable to meet some of the requirements because of the constraints of affordability, etc. that we might not see an airport at Gerald's.

And I've said this before from all that I've been understanding that it is possible that we may never see an airport at Gerald's. What I would really like is an understanding so that we can all really understand that it is not a foregone conclusion that we will have an airport at Gerald's and that somewhere along the line and perhaps be told quite clearly at which point we will know that we will not have an airport at Gerald's if that should ever happen? Is that a possibility at all?

B. Millington: I'll perhaps try to elaborate on exactly why we feel that as design engineers it's our responsibility to inform the final design solution as fully as it's possible by undertaking these studies.

It isn't an unusual part of a process of design even at this stage in the game and I'm well aware of the amount of work that has been done previously but that once that a decision has been made to proceed with this project, the client is absolutely assured that everything that is humanly possible has been done in order to ensure that the project is affordable because a fact of life is that there is a budget for the project as there is for all infrastructure work in the region, on the island and that the project is absolutely certifiably safe. And that we wouldn't be doing our job, as I say even at this stage, it is perfectly normal to undertake these types of confirmatory studies in order to inform the final design solution fully.

You're quite right in that if the conclusions of the studies were that the operating criteria were unlicensable, or that the project was unaffordable those recommendations would have to be put to the funding agencies, the Government of Montserrat in order for them to make a strategic decision as to whether they wanted to proceed with the project.

It isn't the consultant's decision to abort or proceed with the project but simply to inform the client as to what the circumstances are and I just feel—I want to explain that it's a normal part of the process of design to provide as much confirmatory information as possible to give everyone the confidence they need.

And clearly, there has to be budgetary limitation for everything and such is the case that on the basis of all of the work undertaken so far by the Italian consultants, by consultants before them, that the budget is set, appears to be a reasonable budget for the project described on which we are embarking. But still those studies simply add or add significantly to the quality of information available for decision-makers upon which to base their decision on this very vital piece of infrastructure.

J. Romeo: The gentleman who just spoke – I got slightly upset sitting in my—just now and listening to you speak first about budget and then safety. I wish to tell anybody here that once you mention a budget before you talk about safety, I can consider it discriminating and inhumane to come in Montserrat and to first talk about budgets before talking about safety.

When you speak, you speak first and make sure you mention safety first and then talk about the budget. I feel that should be what should be said. And there's talk about safety but it seems to me that basically that finances are dominating Montserrat's safety in this issue.

I'd like to continue by saying I think one of the reasons why most of us are here tonight and Doc mentioned a couple of words: honesty, trust is the big issue here.

Have we trusted DFID for the last few years that they have been in Montserrat and spent almost \$800 million?

Did we trust Brown and Root when they came in here and took a big chunk of that money? Do we trust them?

Do we trust scientists who gave us advice that they'll put up a barrier to stop flows from coming down the mountain while we take aeroplanes at Blackburne?

The question is do we really trust you? And the question is: Really, and I am sorry the words are not coming out—I'm probably should have polished them up a little bit more (*laughter*) but it really comes down to trust and a lot of the flack that is being passed tonight is all because we don't trust you.

The question is will you walk away from \$41 million if you—it can't work? I know that these gentlemen here are not here because they love me or love Montserrat. They are here because of the dollar sign and I am saying that – you can't cut me Governor, I've got to talk. I'm sorry but that is how I feel.

I'm not saying – I am saying that if anything happens coming into Gerald's to 19 people, who will take the responsibility? Who will give Montserrat back its name? Who will send the message to the rest of the world that this is a safe place to travel to? Everybody is willing to take the risk.

There's a lady in the back there and she's from Gerald's and she's been making noise behind there because she says she's not moving. Should you at this point in time have a lady behind who lives in Gerald's talking about she's not leaving. If you had really done some environmental impact and assessment and had really spoken to people and educated them about the process that will take place. Just like the wind studies that are not being taken now, and that wind studies probably are being done concurrently to other studies, it is evident that nobody has really the interest of Montserrat but Montserratians. I could say more but I was just moved to come up and say what I had to say. (*Applause*)

- C. Hogan: Thank you very much. His Excellency was merely indicating to me his desire to be excused.
- A. Longrigg: I wanted to say a couple of words if I could.
- C. Hogan: Oh, yes please sir. Yes.
- A. Longrigg: Like the Minister, I was intending to come here and sit quietly.
- C. Hogan: Sir, one moment sir. Could you please come this way?
- A. Longrigg: Sorry I wasn't wanting to come up here because I just wanted to make a very short comment. Just as Governor, I'm making it because as Governor I also have a role in this issue of safety and this simple issue of safety and trust. It doesn't really matter what you think of the politicians, what you think of DFID or what you think of me—the question of safety is going to be decided by international organizations and if the international organizations don't think

this airport is safe then they won't permit it to be licensed nor the British government. Simple.

Member of Audience: Yeah, just like the heliport.

R. Tyson: Can I ask a question on that point?

C. Hogan: You can't address any questions to the Governor.

R. Tyson: The issue is the safety aspect of the – and I'm addressing this obviously to the panel—that we have heard the – virtually an airport being built yet the wind studies are one of the most important factors on planning an airport. Before you think about an airport you approach the Civil Aviation or the International Civil Aviation or the Federal Aviation and they give you advice and they recommend that wind studies should be done. These wind studies are done by other consultants who are specialists in this field. Yet we hear from Halcrow that they are going to do some imaging and some smoke and this sort of thing and I don't think that is very fair. I think that there is a conflict of interest. These things should be done professionally and they should be done at arms length. *(Applause)*

C. Hogan: Thank you. Might I take this opportunity to comment on the procedural matters because it seems that we have already gone to the construction stage when in fact what they have outlined is a process that will get them to that stage of tendering. So we are not yet building the airport. What we are actually doing are the preliminary studies, which will inform the design and if those studies—between March and May—tell us we can build the airport, then we'll go to a tender procedure for the contract.

In respect of the question of the transparency of the exercise, the exercise for the safety studies will involve interaction with ICAO and the Civil Aviation Authority and the Directorate of Civil Aviation for the OECS. I think I'll have Bill comment further on these issues.

Dr. Lewis: Can I just make one intervention? Yes, I just want to make one intervention. It's a brief intervention, which may hopefully bring us to a conclusion of this meeting, which I think has been useful. This whole airport is a very emotive issue and I don't want anybody to walk away feeling hurt or insulted. People, we all actually have the same objective, which is to get this country moving forward. We know all what we'd like to do. And I think just as a matter of clarification and at least I notice that the gentlemen didn't go a whiter shade of pale because they are probably thick skinned but as far as this issue of trust—I think that trust in professional people, technical staff is something that I've come to accept as, you know, just, it's there because you operate by professional standards.

There's a little bit of confusion in that this consultancy is just for design. It's not \$41 million. They, we still have to award contracts for the construction so that I don't want people out there listening to this radio program to think that people are going to make judgments because of a desire to secure \$41 million. I think it's very important for us to not let that sort of rumor carry on.

And as I said, the technical staff have been quite clear. They said that based on the results of the studies that we will have a true picture of the viability of the project by the end of March but at the same time, they've also indicated that in their opinion from the previous studies and the previous information available that it's quite likely that they'll be able to proceed with the project.

Once again I say that people are acting in an emotive way, quite rightly, because this is a very important issue and obviously, we all know we would have wanted an airport that would take

a Dash-8 or a Hercules or something like that but we would have to know that it can be afforded.

I know that there are private sector groups who are quite rightly going to exercise their option to see if they can do something else and everybody has that right. And the Government of Montserrat will do whatever it can to support that initiative if it has the ability to do it but I think, all in all, I would like all you all to take away from tonight's debate, the facts, which have been presented to you and wait until the end of March when we will be able to decide what's going to happen. Thank you. (*Applause*)

B. Millington:

I couldn't have put that better. Anyone who is interested will have the opportunity to examine our recommendations through Government of Montserrat and the evidence behind those findings and recommendations, which brings me back to the point I want to clarify about the wind assessments, which was mentioned by a gentleman here. I want to be absolutely clear about this point on wind, although it is very detailed but it is an extremely important point.

Quite rightly, it is normal for studies to have been undertaken to determine the usability of a runway or runways in advance of planning. And so it was the case that for the last 3 years, wind data at Gerald's has been compiled and correlated with wind data from the region including old wind data of 30 years from Bramble and wind data from Antigua and that wind data is data which is used to assess the usability of the runway in order to determine the usability from the cross wind and tail wind point of view.

And as I said in my presentation the crosswind and tail wind data that we have for Gerald's is extremely good. It exceeds the licensing authority's minimum requirements for the usability of that runway. It is also, furthermore, far better than the usability of the runway at W.H. Bramble or Blackburne Airport. It is far superior in terms of usability to some of the other options which were considered and analyzed by ICAO and other consultants. It is almost the ideal alignment in terms of usability for an airport of this type.

Now that gives me every confidence that in terms of normal wind analysis, everything that could be done, has been done short of setting up an anemometer for the next 30 years on that site and then making a decision but we have every confidence that the cross wind factors fully satisfy requirements for utilization.

On the point about turbulence this is completely different issue. Turbulence is caused by basically warm air currents rising in this case from the sea up the scarp up to Gerald's and it impacts upon the stability of aircraft upon approach and to an extent, on takeoff.

Now, it is unreasonable to suggest that the firm isn't competent to do this work. We've actually subcontracted the wind modeling work to experts recommended to us by the UK Civil Aviation Authority and they will be undertaking the turbulence studies completely independently from Halcrow. And those results will be available to Government of Montserrat to analyze. So we have no involvement at all or we have no influence over those studies. All we can do is provide the information to the modeling company and assess the results of that information in order to give us that extra safeguard that the Government is looking for. Thank you.

C. Hogan:

Might I just say that the industry people who actually undertake these turbulence studies were referred to UKCAA and Montserrat through the instrumentality of our Airport Manager on Montserrat because we asked him to get in touch with ICAO, I think in Mexico and they referred about six different industry people who are involved in these types of studies to London. And through consultation between Montserrat and us, we were able to arrive at a consensus on which one we will use.

There are a lot of things that go on behind the scenes coming to the airport and you try not to get into the nitty gritty but once you have decided who will undertake the studies, you can't just leave them. You have to keep Halcrow in the situation; you have to keep the ICAO in the situation and the CAA. And it would be the greatest deception since the 2<sup>nd</sup> world war if all of these people, including Montserrat and all of the international people were to collude to give us an airport which is not safe. I will not and cannot believe that.

C. "King" Lee: I would like to ask the gentleman here—if any wind gust studies have been carried out at Gerald's? Two, have there been any—if you cannot meet the requirements at Gerald's for the length to use for the Twin Otter, especially when you have for emergency stop distance, what will you do? Are you going to abandon the whole project? That's one question.

You spoke of the STOL and it's a very critical area and producing landings and so forth. It's very crucial that we—the aircraft doesn't land in the STOL area or using the STOL position to land on and so that we'll be more safer in landing and again the requirement of questionable runway lengths is not as straightforward as you have said but given all the—looking at all the whole area, if you cannot meet the length to use for the Twin Otter, are you going to abandon the project? And, we as a public would like to know, very early, what is going on.

C. Hogan: I'll answer. We did discuss this question today so I'll ask Stephen to speak on the issue of the design.

S. Young: If I understand all of the question fully and I am sure you'll correct me if I've missed a part—what happens if at the end of this, we come up with a runway length that is longer than 500 meters or whatever? I think at the moment we are working with a nominal runway length in a sense.

We have as we've explained previously an amount of money now that has been arrived at for the project—That's been arrived at through the preliminary studies, sorry, through the previous studies undertaken by the Italian Consultants and those before them. Out of that and their assessments, we've come to an amount of money.

The objective that we have set Halcrow is essentially is to come to an operation for a Twin Otter aircraft that is completely safe. I think we have tried to go over that ground and say that we can't have an operation that isn't safe because it won't be licensed but a fully licensed, safe operation there. Now that may mean looking at different runway lengths and indeed it will. And part of their work is to, if you like, get as much as possible out of the budget that's set.

So we will be looking at trying to ensure that we can get the maximum possible runway length out of the money we have available. And that's been part of the work that's been going on. I mean, the geotechnical work last week, what they did essentially was trial pits all over the area so that we have an understanding of how much it's actually going to cost to do the work and then we can feed that back through into the way that we are pricing the contract and then again we can come back and see how much we can get for our money.

And that's the process that is going on at the moment to make sure that we can get, as I say, the maximum we can for the money. And it maybe—I think it's unlikely—but, you know, we can't get enough length. We've got then a serious problem between us, you know, and we've got to address that.

By the end of March, as I say, we—as has been said—the consultants will come back with their inception report that will look fully at lengths, at costs, what is affordable, what we together can afford. And we may have a negative answer. I don't believe so but we may and

if we have a negative answer, I will stand here in front of you in March and share that with you and we'll have to talk about it together.

Have I answered your question? That's always a dangerous question to ask.

Members of audience:(*Indecipherable*)

S. Young: Ok. Turbulence I think has been talked about but I think I can recap. There have been a number of studies that have been—and other ways we are looking at that turbulence. They include additional instrumentation that is being installed around the airport site at this present time. The Airport Manager is working on getting that additional instrumentation in around the site.

We have the physical modeling of the site in a wind tunnel looking at smoke then and the way that interacts with the topography and the currents that that generates and that will be recorded. And all of that testing will be agreed previously with the CAA and then made available to them.

And then the other way that we'll be looking at it is with the flight simulations that will be undertaken in about three weeks time and they will include Roy Marsden, part of the Halcrow team, but acting essentially as an independent observer of those trials to participate in them. And so we've got all those ways that we're trying to address these questions. I hope that's some help anyway to give you a picture of the lengths we are going to—to try to ensure that the turbulence issue is fully addressed.

C. Hogan: Having respect also because we failed to answer one question before—having respect of course, for the privacy of professionals in respect of their salaries and I think the Honorable Minister tried to suggest to you that we are not all giving Halcrow \$41 million. What is happening is that \$41 million is the allocated amount and all of the exercises to get use to including construction has to come out of that 41 million.

All of us here are professionals and based on our qualifications and expertise, we have a salary and that's just about it. I can't tell you how is Bill's salary and so on and so forth. But it all comes out of the 41; it does not all go to Halcrow. Some stay in Montserrat and I hope a lot more stay in Montserrat.

B. Roach: Just a little bit of housework and just a little bit of clarification— Since it was mentioned by our first speaker, by our Permanent Secretary where he said that there are in fact worse airports in the region. He said worse airports and I wish he didn't use that word—and where they have few, if any, accidents at all. That's one. Can somebody tell us where some of these airports might be? And two, the reference was made to international airports and what I would like to get sort of clarified—Is it international because it's going to be certified by or built to international standards? What qualifies is as an international airport? Just to educate us a little bit.

B. Millington: I think, with my reference to airports where standards are not up to the same standard that we're looking for—there are airports where they have work to do over the next—between now and September 2003, which is the date on which Amendment 4 of ICAO Annex 14 comes into force, which requires those airports (which includes Melville Hall, for example—I don't want to pull out Dominica but I just know it – where the situation in terms of obstructions, the general condition of the strip, of the runway, geometric standards, appearances and so on—fall below the standards.

And that doesn't mean that operators don't know about that. All aircraft operators are full informed as to what deviations from standards are as our colleague here who is a flyer will tell you that notification to pilots is always available through NOTAMS and AIPs. Now those

airports I mentioned, Canefield and Melville Hall fall below the standards that ICAO set as the ideal standards.

What I'm saying is that we have a chance to start from scratch at Gerald's and we also have an obligation through Amendment 4 to introduce standards which fully comply with ICAO standards and therefore will produce an airport which complies with ICAO standards in a way that many airports in the region don't. If we look at the Airport at Castries at Vigie, there is an obstruction on takeoff, on takeoff away from the sea which is in a different league in terms of its severity to the obstruction environment at Gerald's.

Gerald's actually has no obstructions on approach and takeoff. Now that is not the case at a very considerable number of airports in the Caribbean, some of which enjoy, will enjoy better status or shall we say a greater classification than Gerald's would, which would be a Code 1B airport.

So I think I'm confident in saying that the standards we are aiming for are much more compliant with ICAO desirable standards and recommendations than many of the neighbors. But that is not a criticism of other airports which are licensed by DCA. It simply means that those airports have to notify operators that standards do fall below desirables and those operators are aware of those noncompliances.

I'm sorry I lost—You had another question.

*(Indecipherable – several people speaking simultaneously away from mike)*

B. Millington: Yeah, I mean, the classification of the airport whether it be international or not international doesn't have a significant effect on the standard of design. If it's an international ...

*(Break in tape)*

B. Millington: ... function of the building and passenger handling so the fact that it's an international airport—although most airports in the Caribbean are international airports, doesn't particularly affect the standard of design. Yeah, there are one or two non-international airports in the Caribbean, in Jamaica, for instance, maybe one or two but the standards of design are largely similar because obviously the aircraft are all the same whether they are operating in internationally or domestic.

R. Tyson: I mean, how did you measure the gusting wind at Gerald's?

B. Millington: How did we?

R. Tyson: There's no equipment at Gerald's to measure wind gusting. You made reference and said you've got all that information.

B. Millington: Yeah. We have a wind rose for Gerald's which is three years worth of data which includes ...

R. Tyson: *(Indecipherable)* gusts?

B. Millington: It measures wind from all points of the compass and all velocities.

R. Tyson: *(Indecipherable)* as everybody knows at Gerald's you can have tremendous wind of 30 or 40 knots in two or three minutes ...

B. Millington: It does—The wind rose (and I can discuss this later – I will show you the wind rose) and it measures wind speeds of all frequencies. And you can see from the wind rose for Gerald's

that the predominance of winds is as you would expect are from the sector which favors the approach from the west. The lesser winds are from the other direction.

*(Indecipherable)*

B. Millington: The wind measurement devices do measure gusts. They measure wind speeds. They do, as to the wind measurement information at Blackburne and at V.C. Bird. Anyway I—We can discuss this and that information is available.

C. Hogan: I'd like to ask Stephen O'Driscoll—since the question was asked to just walk us through again the steps we're going to take coming up to May—as the Project Manager. What's the inception stage again? Just to remind us what we have ahead of us and I suspect that we'll do this as sort of a wrap-up session unless there are any other burning, really pertinent questions.

J. Romeo: I'll just like to find out when we might be able to have a peak at the terms of reference? The public.

C. Hogan: Sir, terms of reference come under international standards and they include certain private affairs of people and that's a matter you have to decide with them. But I can tell you what the terms -- once I discuss with the Project Officers what the terms are in respect of the airport, in terms of the design, what we've asked them to design and what options—we can take that out and let you have it. And I'll do that maybe from tomorrow. But it's a little bit of an exercise because you're asking me to break out just the pertinent information in respect of the design and construction.

J. Romeo: So far these men have been given a terms of reference.

C. Hogan: Yes.

J. Romeo: I would prefer to see it, the public at large.

C. Hogan: Yes.

Member of audience: Claude that's nonsense. The terms of reference for SEA was part of its report. Therefore it has to be public knowledge—either that or it was a private arrangement as to how they got hired.

C. Hogan: I was, I was – Yes maam.

Members of audience:*(Indecipherable- question concerned why the Civil Aviation Authority in England was uncomfortable with STOL operations)*

B. Millington: The Civil Aviation Authority only had one airport, which was London City Airport. And the reason it was licensed for that type of operation was because there were high buildings on the approach. I don't know how familiar you are with the area of East London but there are some very high-rise buildings on the approach. And so the STOL aircraft approached at a very steep angle of descent, 7½ degrees, which is twice as steep as a normal aircraft and it was able to operate by having it licensed as a special case, calling it a STOL airport.

What happened in the event was one of the buildings was demolished, one of the near structures was demolished and it was no longer an obstruction. Aircraft of a different type were then brought in and their performance were superior.

And the CAA decided that it was, I suppose, a disadvantage to have one particular airport licensed to its own set of standards, when it wasn't actually any more necessary to do so. So

it re-licensed the airport using ordinary, conventional standards of licensing. And it now is fully licensed and you know, compliant with normal licensing standards.

So the CAA in the UK no longer has any STOL airports in its books.

C. Hogan:

Well folks, I want to thank you all very much for coming. I believe we have exhausted the discussion up to this point. This is only what I refer to as the second phase after the preliminary stage.

We are now doing the design and testing and studies mode. When we get to the next level on or about March and between now and then I'll keep you informed as to the activities and as the Government of Montserrat will be required to make further decisions in respect of housing reallocation and planning decisions, etc. Thank you all very much and I hope you have a very pleasant evening and continue to work in the interest of Montserrat. Bye Bye.