

**Question for written answer E-001878/2016
to the Commission**

Rule 130

Tania González Peñas (GUE/NGL)

Subject: AENA Spain File

In 2009, the European Commission issued a reasoned opinion to Spain for failing to comply with the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) on the expansion of Terminal 4 of Madrid-Barajas airport. According to the statement, AENA should have bought 750 hectares of land along the Jarama and Henares river banks, but in the end it only bought 183 hectares. According to the EIS, it should have bought 500 hectares in an effort to replenish the catchment basin, for which EUR 2.3 million were invested, but that never happened.

In 2013, the Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Environment, headed by Miguel Arias Cañete, amended the Act on Environmental Impact Assessment to enable the EIS to be amended 'when circumstances give rise to errors'. This amendment affected the Terminal 4 case. On 24 April 2015, the requirements put forward by the EIS were amended in the Official State Gazette and the European Commission officially closed the file in June.

Given that the European Commission launched the investigation in 2009, four years before the Act on Environmental Impact Assessment was amended, why has the Commission closed the file if the requirements of the EIS have not been met?