

Philippe Maystadt, President
European Investment Bank
100 boulevard Konrad Adenauer
L-2950 Luxembourg

In Banská Bystrica, 4. 5. 2009

Dear Mr. President Maystadt,

The Slovak Republic is trying to undertake the construction of a motorway network on its territory. One of the first motorways that the government is trying to finish is the D1 motorway link between Bratislava and Košice. The current government has repeatedly declared its intention to finish the link between Bratislava and Košice by 2010. This has markedly influenced the quality of the preparation works for some sections, particularly the "D1 Turany – Hubová" section. This section is part of the project "Slovak Motorways (PPP) D1 Phase I", which has been submitted for financing to the European Investment Bank (EIB) and European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD).

With this letter we aim to outline breaches of EU legislation we believe have taken place during the preparation of the Turany – Hubová section, and request the EIB and EBRD to halt plans for financing for the project until the following issues have been resolved. Likewise we call upon the European Commission to reconsider its acceptance of the project.

A. Unjustified prolongation of the validity of the final EIA statement.

The environmental impact assessment of several variants of the D1 Turany – Hubová section (as part of the longer section Martin – Ľubochňa) was performed between 1995 and 2002 according to Act No. 127/1994 on Environmental Impact Assessment. **On 12 November 2002, the Ministry of Environment SR (MoE SR) issued a Final Environmental Impact Statement No. 1832/02-4.3 on the construction of the D1 Martin - Ľubochňa Motorway (including the Turany – Hubová section) (see annex No. 1).** The mentioned Act did not define the validity of the final statement.

On 1 February 2006 Act No. 24/2006 on Environmental Impact Assessment (hereafter "new EIA act") came into force. According to this Act it is necessary to ask the Ministry to prolong the validity (§ 65 section 5) of any final statement issued before 1 February 2006 if no proceedings to approve the assessed activity by special regulations were started. According to § 37, section 7, the condition for its prolongation is that the **"promoter provides written proof that there were no substantial changes in the proposed activity, conditions on the site concerned, new facts connected with the subject content of the report on activity assessment and in the development of new technologies for carrying out of the proposed activity"**. On 27 June 2006 Národná diaľničná spoločnosť a.s., Bratislava (the National Motorway Company, joint stock company, based in Bratislava)

(hereafter „promoter“) asked the MoE SR for prolongation of the final statement by using the mentioned § 65 section 5 of the new EIA act. **The MoE SR prolonged the validity of the final statement by decision No. 8344/06 – 7.3./ml of 8 August 2006** until 1 February 2008 (see annex 2). Thus the statement from November 2002 remained unchanged until February 2008. MoE SR's decision was based on the following:

- A declaration by the promoter, that there were neither substantial changes in the proposed activity, conditions on the site, nor new facts connected with the subject content of the assessment report,

- A written explanation by the promoter that the assessed activity was divided into two separate parts as part of technical preparation. One of the parts (Dubná Skala – Turany section) had already been issued a land-use permit whereas the second (Turany – Ľubochňa) had not yet been issued a land-use permit. However, the MTPaT SR requested by letter No. 1053/2430 – 05. of 30 June 2005 the preparation of a combined land-tunnel route with a total length of tunnels of 4900m.

At the time of the prolongation of the validity of the final statement (8/2006) the Slovak republic had already become an EU member state and in accordance with the Treaty of Accession sites were identified on its territory that the Slovak Republic proposed to include into the NATURA 2000 Networking Programme in conformity with the Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora and Council Directive 79/409/EEC of 2 April 1979 on the conservation of wild birds.

The national list of sites of Community importance was approved by government of SR Resolution No. 230/2004 of 17 March 2004 and an announcement of the MoE SR of the decree on the national list of sites of Community importance was published in the 2004 Collection, part 192, under No. 450. Decree 3/2004-5.1 of 14 July 2004 itself was published in the MoE SR Bulletin, year XII, part 3 and **came into force on 1 August 2004**. The national list of proposed special protected areas was passed by a decision of the SR government No. 636 of 9 July 2003 and published in MoE SR Bulletin No. XI, part 4.

Some of the sites that the Slovak Republic proposed to include in the NATURA 2000 Networking Programme are located on the route of the aforementioned motorway. It is true that at the time of the assessment itself these sites were not identified and thus implications of the motorway for them could not have been assessed. However, at the time the final statement was prolonged the sites had already been known for two years. **Thus the declaration of the promoter that there were no substantial changes in the conditions of the location regarding changes in necessary protection is not true. We would also like to draw attention to the fact that the new EIA act says that written proof of there being neither substantial changes in the proposed activity, conditions within the area, new facts connected with the content of the activity assessment report, nor development of new technologies for performing the proposed activity should be provided and not a just declaration of the promoter as stated in the decision of the MoE SR.**

B. Disregarding the recommendations resulting from the EIA statement and implementing another route with an apparently greater negative impact

The final environmental impact statement on the construction of the D1 Martin – L'ubochňa Motorway issued by the MoE SR under No. 1832/02-4.3 of 12 November 2002 recommended variant B1 (variant with the Korbela tunnel) in the B section. However currently the promoter is advancing with a routing through the Vah valley with one shorter tunnel (Rojkov), excluding the Korbela tunnel (See annexes 3 and 5).

This surface route of motorway between the Turany crossroads (km 0.000) and Kral'ovany crossroads (km 6.734 04) has not been assessed for its environmental impact according to the relevant act on environmental impact assessment and interferes with the following parts of the NATURA 2000 network:

- sites of Community importance (SCI):
 - SK SCI 0253 Váh River
 - SK SCI 0252 Malá Fatra
 - SK SCI 0238 Veľká Fatra
 - SK SCI 0243 Orava River
- special protection areas (SPAs) :
 - SK SPA 013 Malá Fatra

This route was issued a land-use permit by the Municipality of Ružomberok No. SP 4050/2007-TA1-1-Ta on 18 January 2008 (annex 4). The promoter asked the Ministry of Transport, Posts and Telecommunications for a building permit, even though it had already been issued.

The currently proposed variant (for which the land-use permit and building permit have been issued) crosses the cadastral territory of Turany, Ratkovo, Šútovo, Kral'ovany, Stankovany, Švošov and Hubová.

The following biotopes of Community importance were registered on the currently proposed route:

- Rivers with muddy banks with *Chenopodium rubri* p.p. and *Bidentition* p.p. vegetation (code 3270)
- Water courses of plain to montane levels with *Ranunculion fluitantis* and *Callitricho-Batrachion* vegetation (code 3260)
- Alpine rivers and the herbaceous vegetation along their banks (code 3220)
- Hygrophilous tall herb fringe communities of plains and of the montane to alpine levels (code 6430)
- Lowland hay meadows (*Alopecurus pratensis*, *Sanguisorba officinalis*) (code 6510)
- Mixed ash-alder alluvial forests of temperate and Boreal Europe (*Alno-Padion*, *Alnion incanae*, *Salicion albae*) (code 91E0*)
- *Sperulo-Fagetum* beech forests (code 9130)
- *Luzulo-Fagetum* beech forests (code 9110)

- **Medio-European limestone beech forests of the Cephalanthero-Fagion (code 9150)**
- **Tilio-Acerion forests of slopes, screes and ravines (code 9180*)**
- **Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies on calcareous substrates (Festuco-Brometalia) (code 6210)**

The following species of Community importance have been located in the mentioned territory:

Plants: *Cypripedium calceolus*

Animals: *Carabus zawadzskii*, *Carabus variolosus*, *Pseudogaurotina excellens*, *Callimorpha quadripunctaria*, *Rhysodes sulcatus*, **Rosalia alpina*, *Leptidea morsei*, *Cottus gobio*, *Gobio uranoscopus*, *Hucho hucho*, *Zingel streber*, *Triturus montandoni*, *Bombina variegata*, *Bufo viridis*, *Hyla arborea*, *Coronella austriaca*, *Lacerta agilis*, *Barbastella barbastellus*, *Eptesicus nilssonii*, *Eptesicus serotinus*, *Myotis bechstenii*, *Myotis blythi*, *Myotis dasycneme*, *Myotis daubentoni*, *Myotis myotis*, *myotis emarginatus*, *Rhinolopus hipposideros*, *Rhinolophus ferrumequinum*, **Canis lupus*, *Lutra lutra*, *Felis silvestris*, *Lynx lynx*, *Muscardinus avellanarius*, **Ursus arctos*

Birds: *Falco peregrinus*, *Aquila chrysaetos*, *Bubo bubo*, *Picus canus*, *Aegolius funereus*, *Dendrocopos leucotos*, *Dryocopus martius*, *Ficedula albicollis*, *Monticola saxatilis*, *Alcedo atthis*, *Ciconia nigra*, *Pernis apivorus*, *Strix uralensis*, *Caprimulgus europaeus*, *Dendrocopos syriacus*, *Crex crex*, *Glaucidium passerinum*, *Bonasa bonasia*, *Lanius excubitor*, *Coturnix coturnix*, *Phoenicurus phoenicurus*, *Muscicapa striata*, *Tetrao urogallus*, *Tetrao tetrix*, *Picoides tridactylus* a *Ficedula parva*.

Since the proposed motorway route lies only a few metres away, biotopes of Community importance such as Ra6 alkaline fens (code 7230), Lk4 Molinia meadows (code 6410) and Ls7.1 Birch bog woodland (code 91D0*) as well as *Vertigo angustiot* and *Vertigo geyeri* species found in the Rojkov peatbog nature reserve, which is part of SK SCI Veľká Fatra, could also be indirectly negatively influenced by a change of water regime.

C. Lack of environmental assessment regarding NATURA 2000 impact.

In the D1 Turany – Hubová motorway environmental assessment process the Korbělka tunnel variant was evaluated as the most environmentally acceptable, that minimizes the impact on the territory's environment, on protected and endangered species and on the national network of protected areas.

In view of the fact that the Korbělka tunnel (almost 5.7 km long) would bypass almost all important natural habitats in the mentioned territory, we suppose that out of all proposed variants it would have the lowest impact on the proposed NATURA 2000 sites. However, this cannot be claimed with certainty, since neither the **D1 Turany – Hubová Korbělka tunnel variant nor other motorway alternatives in this section were assessed regarding their impact on the NATURA 2000 network sites in accordance with valid national legislation and article 6.3 of Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora.**

According to article 6.3 of Council Directive No. 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora any plan or project not directly connected with or necessary to the management of the site but likely to have significant effect thereon, either individually or in combination with other plans or projects, **shall be subject to appropriate assessment of its impact** on the site in view of the site's conservation objectives. In the light of the conclusions of the assessment of the impact on the site and subject to the provisions of article 6.4, the competent national authorities shall agree to the plan or project only after having ascertained that it will not adversely affect the integrity of the site concerned and, if appropriate, after having obtained the opinion of the general public. Article 4 says that if, in spite of a negative assessment of the impact on the site and **in the absence of alternative solutions**, a plan or project must nevertheless be carried out for imperative reasons of overriding public interest, including those of a social or economic nature, the Member State shall take all compensatory measures necessary to ensure that the overall coherence of Natura 2000 is protected. It shall inform the Commission of the compensatory measures adopted. Where the site concerned hosts a priority natural habitat type and/or a priority species, the only considerations which may be raised are those relating to human health or public safety, to beneficial consequences of primary importance for the environment or, further to an opinion from the Commission, to other imperative reasons of overriding public interest. These regulations were transposed into § 28 Act No. 543/2002 on Nature and Landscape Protection.

Considering the facts from part B. it is apparent that the currently advanced route of the D1 motorway in the Turany – Hubová part **was not subject to appropriate assessment of its implications for NATURA 2000 in view of the sites' conservation objectives according to the new EIA act, which is inconsistent with article 6.3 of Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora.**

Article 6.4 of Council Directive No. 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora says that *„If, **in spite of a negative assessment of the implications for the site and in the absence of alternative solutions**, a plan or project must nevertheless be carried out for imperative reasons of overriding public interest, including those of a social or economic nature, the Member State shall take all compensatory measures necessary to ensure that the overall coherence of Natura 2000 is protected. It shall inform the Commission of the compensatory measures adopted.“* This means that if the project is in any way connected with sites included in the NATURA 2000 Network (or in sites approved by ES Commission according to article 4.2 of Council Directive No. 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora), has a negative impact on the site and alternative solutions are absent then it can be approved after satisfying the conditions defined by article 6.4 of Council Directive No. 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora. In other words, **a plan or project with a negative impact on the site as defined by article 6.4 of Council Directive No. 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora can start being approved only if an alternative solution to the plan or project is absent.**

From our point of view it is clear that by carrying out the project there will be negative impacts on the sites concerned as pointed out in section B. of this

complaint. This is indirectly referred to even in the carried out environmental impact assessment whose final statement on the D1 Martin - L'ubochňa Motorway construction (MoE SR No. 1832/02-4.3 of 12 November 2002) recommended the B1 variant in the B section (Turany – Hubová) (ie. the Korbeľka tunnel alternative). Even though the facts resulting from Council Directive No. 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora were not taken into consideration in this environmental impact assessment, very important is the fact that **within the process of environmental impact assessment the B1 Korbeľka tunnel variant was definitely recommended as being environmentally the most acceptable in comparison to the B2 surface variant through the Vah valley with two smaller tunnels** (the variant to a certain extent similar to the one currently advanced).

As a result it is clear that the **currently advanced variant** of the motorway route **has a real alternative** in the form of the aforementioned B1 variant with the Korbeľka tunnel that is far more acceptable from an environmental point of view.

Thus the currently enforced motorway route does not meet the conditions for approval by article 6.4 of Council Directive No. 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora since its performance will from our point of view (and according to the aforementioned final statement) have a negative impact on the sites concerned. **Approval could be given only if there is no other alternative, which is not true** because a real alternative exists.

Based on this, the implementation of the currently advanced motorway route would contravene article 6.4 of Council Directive No. 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora.

Archive documents of the State Nature Conservancy of the Slovak Republic (SNC SR) contain evidence that the Ministry of Transport, Posts and Telecommunications of the Slovak Republic (hereafter "MTPaT SR") had as early as 2005 been informed about the possibility that the project's performance could have negative impacts on the proposed NATURA 2000 network sites. Also MTPaT was notified that the assessment of the extent and significance of implications requires deeper evaluation of the activities with an analysis of potential negative implications on the subject of conservation. (statement of the State Nature Conservancy of the Slovak republic, the Centre for Nature and Landscape Conservation in Banská Bystrica to the project on cofinancing of an expert study of D1 Turany – Hubová construction from the TEN-T budget No. COPK 1125/05 of the 17 June 2005).

The Ministry of Environment of the Slovak Republic, Department of Nature and Landscape Protection **did not publish** the declaration according to the annex I-B of the ES form on the study for the D1 Turany – Hubová section of the proposed project in 2005, because a declaration could have been published only if - based on the results of the environmental impact assessment or other facts - the project would probably not have a significant impact on the (proposed) NATURA 2000 sites.

MoE SR Nature Protection Department observes in letter No. 1752/701/2005-5.1 of 21 June 2005 addressed to the MTPaT SR Road Infrastructure Section that in the already finished environmental impact assessment (Act No. 127/1994) the implications for the sites that the Slovak Republic submitted to the European Commission as proposed NATURA 2000 sites could not have been taken into consideration and suggests acquiring additional data and deeper assessment of the project's implications for the proposed NATURA 2000 sites, ie. for the favourable

status of biotopes and species of Community importance as results from the article 6 of a directive on biotopes.

As late as two years after acquiring this information and three years after having identified NATURA sites on the proposed route the company Dopravoprojekt, a.s. Bratislava ordered a study "Assessment of the implications of the proposed D1 Turany – Hubová Motorway for the sites of the NATURA 2000 Network" by the company Creative s.r.o. Pezinok, that was delivered in November 2007.

We believe that this study cannot substitute for the process of an appropriate assessment as required by article 6.3 of Council Directive No. 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora as transposed into new EIA Act and Act No 543/2002 on Nature and Landscape Protection. The study shows several significant indications of inaccuracy, incompleteness and vagueness. Many of the proposed compensatory measures are not applicable, insufficient or are technically speaking almost unfeasible.

Neither is the aforementioned study supported by the new EIA Act nor by Act No. 543/2002 on Nature and Landscape Protection. The public had no possibility at all to raise points of order or express opinions on the assessment as enabled by the Council Directive No. 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora and Directive No. 85/337/EEC on the assessment of the effects of certain public and private projects on the environment, amended and supplemented by directives 97/11/EC and 2003/35/EC (hereafter only "EIA directive").

It arises from case-law of the European Court of Justice that an **institution permitting a project can grant permission only if it is sure that the plan or project will not have an adverse impact on territorial integrity**. Even though authorities rely on the best knowledge available, there cannot be any scientific doubts: studies must not have gaps; they have to be complete, thorough and contain unambiguous findings. If the concerned site of Community importance hosts so called priority species then arguments can be taken into consideration "relating to human health or public safety, beneficial consequences of primary importance for the environment or, further to an opinion from the Commission, to other imperative reasons of overriding public interest". **Still, alternative solutions to all these cases must be considered, and so called compensatory measures to "compensate" for the loss of biotopes or territory must be approved, too**. The applicant shall implement the compensatory measures before destroying the biotope/territory and the European Commission must be informed by the Ministry of Environment SR in an ordered format.

The aforementioned article 6 on biotopes says **that a project can be approved if other alternative solutions are absent even in cases where it will probably have vital unfavourable implications**. The Directive (as well as national legislation) makes it possible to approve a project only if there are "other imperative reasons of overriding public interest including those of a social and economic character".

In the case of the D1 Motorway Turany – Hubová section the construction:

- contravenes a route recommended in the final statement issued by the MoE SR under No. 1832/02-4.3 of 12 November 2002,

- is being built on a route that was not assessed according to the new EIA Act which is contrary to the EIA Directive and Council Directive No. 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora,
- is being built on a route which has a real alternative in the variant recommended in the final statement issued by MoE SR No. 1832/02-4.3 of 12 November 2002
- is being built on a route that does not represent the least impact for the sites of the NATURA 2000 network.

D: Estimated impact on NATURA 2000 sites.

Each presented variant of the proposed construction will have adverse impacts on biotopes and species of Community and national importance, will negatively influence reproduction and survival of species even in more remote areas of construction (places of reproduction, food gathering, shelters and wintering places), will cause a barrier to birds, will cause constant collisions with wild animals (collisions with vehicles, birds hitting tall and long bridges), damage the refuge and corridor function of this area, cause the spread of weeds and invasive species along the motorway with subsequent changes in natural communities, will probably harm the water regime of unique protected areas and last but not least will damage the landscape structure and perception of the Upper Vah pass.

The following institutions drew attention to the above mentioned in their statements: Veľká Fatra National Park Board (statements No. NPVF/1397/2007, NPVF/1425/2007 of 28 November 2007, No.NPVF/1124/21007 of 13 September 2007), Tatra National Park Board under (No. TANAP/1186/2007, RCOPTŠ/538/2007 of 26 November 2007), Malá Fatra National Park Board (No. NPMF/963/2007/2 of 29 November 2007). The same problem is addressed in expert materials for the headquarters of the State Nature Conservancy of the Slovak Republic Banská Bystrica – forms for fact-finding proceedings and information on NATURA 2000 declaration (MoE SR, Nature and Landscape Protection, Bratislava, November 2007).

E. Approval procedures

According to article 8 of Council Directive 85/337/EEC of 27 June 1985 on the assessment of the effects of certain public and private projects on the environment, the consultation results together with information from articles 5, 6 and 7 of the Directive must be taken into consideration in the approval procedure. By § 38 of the new EIA Act the content of the final statement on the activity must be taken into consideration in the decision-making process of permitting the activity. At the same time, the permitting authority cannot issue a permit for the proposed activity without the final statement on the activity in question being attached to the request for issuing the land-use permit.

It is impossible to find out from the text of the land-use permit (*annex No. 4*) how or whether the permitting authority took the content of the final statement into consideration. On the contrary, in the text of the land-use permit there is no

mention of any environmental assessment taking place or of any recommendation of any variant other than the one given planning approval.

Such practise is in breach of article 8 of Council Directive 85/337/EEC as well as § 38 of the new EIA Act.

F. Other important facts

The European Commission has initiated several proceedings according to article 226 of the Treaty Establishing the European Community due to (1) nontransposition and nonnotification of Directives, (2) inappropriate transposition of Directives or (3) incorrect application of Directives. The above mentioned unresolved deficiency in the transposition of Directives creates a situation in which the Directives are breached due to their poor transposition into Slovak law, even if the national regulation is observed. Regarding the motorway route, the following cases are meant:

Council Directive 79/409/EEC of 2 April 1979 on the conservation of wild birds supplemented by article 7 **Council Directive 92/43/EEC** of 21 May 1992 on the Conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora:

Number of proceeding: 2006/2141;

Number of proceeding: 2006/2153;

Council Directive No 85/337/EEC of 27 June 1985 On the assessment of the effects of certain public and private projects on the environment:

Number of proceeding: 2007/2385;

All sites of Community importance identified on the mentioned motorway route were included in the NATURA 2000 network by the Decision of the Commission of 25th January 2008 that accepts the first updated list of sites of Community importance in Alpine biogeographical regions according to Council Directive 92/43/EHS.

- SK SCI0253 Váh Rver
- SK SCI0252 Malá Fatra
- SK SCI0238 Veľká Fatra
- SK SCI0243 Orava River

As a result, when approving the activity on the aforementioned territories, the Slovak Republic, in accordance with case C 117/03 (Dragaggi), had to exercise the provisions of article 6 section 2 of Council Directive No. 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora until their inclusion into the NATURA 2000 network.

Regarding the Mala Fatra special protection area 013 it is necessary to mention that the Slovak Republic has not yet provided for the conservation conditions nor has it defined the borders of the mentioned special protection area despite the fact that it should have done so by the EU accession date.

G. Conclusion

Based on the aforementioned facts, we state that:

1. The D1 Turany – Hubová Motorway construction represents a serious impact on the NATURA 2000 network, and there are alternative solutions that could considerably reduce this impact.
2. When permitting the construction D1 Turany – Hubová Motorway the final statement issued by the MoE SR of 12 November 2002 was not taken into consideration thus contravening Council Directive 85/337/EEC of 27 June 1985 and Act No. 26/2004 on the assessment of effects on the environment.
3. The validity of the final statement issued by the MoE SR on 12 November 2002 was prolonged in contradiction with the new EIA Act, since when the decision on prolonging was issued there were significant changes in the proposed activity (new motorway route) as well as in conditions of the area concerned (changed conditions for the protection of nature).

Therefore we ask the European Investment Bank to reconsider its decision to finance the "Slovak Motorways (PPP) D1 Phase I" until a new environmental impact assessment of the D1 Turany – Hubová Motorway has been carried out in accordance with the valid national legislation and with the Community Law of the European Community.

We ask the European Investment Bank not to finance the project "Slovak Motorways (PPP) D1 Phase I" and thus prevent from execution such steps that would preset the route D1 Turany – Hubová Motorway until a new assessment of implications for the environment has been done.

Sincerely

Juraj Zamkovský, Executive Director, Priatelia Zeme-CEPA

Miroslav Demko, Executive Director, SOS BirdLife Slovensko

Ján Topercer, ecologist, Botanical Garden UK Bratislava

Annexes:

(available at http://www.priateliazeme.sk/cepa/bwn/d1_turany_hubova_annexes.zip)

1. Final statement from environmental impact assessment of the project Diaľnica D1 Martin – Ľubochňa

2. Decision of MoE SR No. 8344/06 – 7.3./ml from 8.8.2006 on prolongation of validity of the final statement from environmental impact assessment of the project Diaľnica D1 Martin – Ľubochňa until 1.2.2008
3. Graphic attachment to documentation for land-use permit of the project Diaľnica D1 Turany - Hubová – promoted route
4. Decision of Municipality of Ružomberok No. SP 4050/2007-TA1-1-Ta from 18.1.2008 on localization of construction Diaľnica D1 Turany – Hubová (land-use permit)
5. Variants of the project Diaľnica D1 Turany – Hubová.