

**Question for written answer P-006118/2018
to the Commission**

Rule 130

Bas Eickhout (Verts/ALE)

Subject: Rules on environmental impact assessments concerning CO₂ emissions

According to the European Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Directive, all relevant environmental impacts of an activity, such as construction of new infrastructure, have to be taken into account in reporting and weighed up. This includes the impact of CO₂ emissions.

In the Netherlands, the recent EIA for Lelystad Airport also included a calculation of the anticipated CO₂ emissions. These were calculated for aircraft emissions up to an altitude of 900 metres / 3 000 feet, as were emissions of particulates and NO_x. This is logical for NO_x, as emissions at higher altitude no longer have any relevant impact on human beings and the natural environment on the ground that can be attributed to the airport. However, in the case of CO₂, the environmental impact to be taken into account is quite different. CO₂ emissions above 900 metres are equally relevant to the climate. And the other high-altitude aircraft missions, such as those of water vapour and particulate matter (condensation nuclei for cloud formation), actually have a greater impact on climate than emissions at ground level.

Is it true that emissions of CO₂ and particulates above 900 m, and water vapour in its entirety, are disregarded in the relevant EIA in line with EU legislation?

If so, what is the rationale for disregarding their impact?

Does the Commission also agree that the total impact is relevant, including therefore CO₂ emissions at higher altitude or even outside the Netherlands which are facilitated by an airport?