

## HEATHROW PROJECT BOARD MEETING NOTE

10 July 2006

---

**Attended:** Jonathan Moor, Chair [REDACTED] BAA  
Martin Capstick, AED [REDACTED] HA  
David Gray AED Susan Hamilton DAB  
Jeff Thompson EAMI [REDACTED] CAA  
Sam Whatling, APD [REDACTED] TfL  
Victoria Robb RSTRAT6 [REDACTED] TfL  
Becky Wood LTD2 Natalie Wirth AED 3

**Apologies for absence:** None received.

### ITEM 1: MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING (13 June)

1. These were agreed, noting the final sentence of paragraph 8 which had been amended following exchanges with the HA.

### ITEM 2: MATTERS ARISING/ TABLE OF ACTIONS

2. Action points from the last meeting were this month set out in a Table of Actions, which had been circulated in advance. Those not covered elsewhere were noted as follows:

Action 1: [REDACTED] from BATA will start next month to lead the 'Delivery Project'.

Action 2: The Environment Council considered the latest text of the Directive at the end of June. It agreed a 'general approach' (subject to Parliamentary ratification later in the autumn) which left limit values unchanged; endorsed the proposed 5 year derogation for compliance with NO<sub>2</sub> (where action plans are in place); and agreed that there was no requirement to measure compliance on the carriageway of roads or in areas where the public has no access and there is no permanent habitation. [REDACTED] said that this has some unhelpful elements for the HA as it confirms that footways, such as that beside the A4, will be within the ambit of the Directive. There was also concern that it was ambiguous whether the Directive also extended to air quality in the Central Area, where there was currently no monitoring. These issues needed clarifying – with Defra if necessary - ahead of consultation. Martin Capstick noted that this was also something of concern to other airports. AED should report back at the next meeting on further discussions with Defra and others.

**Action: DfT**

Action 6: BAA are preparing papers for the next Roads Technical meeting on 21 July and will be providing (by 18 July) something on air quality hotspots

### ITEM 3: RISKS

4. David Gray explained that risk 1.1 had been elevated to residual High in light of the ongoing MM ConOps discussions. He acknowledged that there had been little change to many of the risks. This was because, until we began to receive modelling results, we would not be able confidently to downgrade many risks. This should, however, be possible in the early autumn as modelling results emerged.

5. On 2.1, Martin Capstick said that the modelling results would be needed to inform an idea of the cost of mitigation measures. On 2.2, he reiterated that he was encouraged by his discussion with Defra and believed that enough movement had been achieved on the Directive to provide the level of both comfort and discretion that could be expected.

6. On 3.3, he acknowledged that the security incident on 10 August would be unhelpful in terms of opposition from residents to increased capacity and acknowledged that little had more had been done this month to mitigate against this risk. [REDACTED] mentioned the recent local news programme on the 'impact of uncertainty'. He explained that many residents found the process hard to understand and many believed that Government had already made decisions on further development. David Gray confirmed the DfT's willingness, in principle, to engage more regularly with local focus groups.

7. On 2.4, [REDACTED] commented that if some road charging might be necessary to meet AQ limits even without new development, this could help to prepare people for a potentially substantial charge at a later stage to facilitate airport expansion.

### ITEM 4: PROJECT PLANS

8. MM Project Plan: [REDACTED] noted that we might have to revisit this in light of the safety case being drawn up by NATS over the coming month. [REDACTED] said that the current assumption was that, if only a relatively small amount of capacity were lost and the safety issue surrounding 1 minute splits could be resolved, we would continue with the current plan. If this could not be done, substantial amounts of work would need to be revisited.

9. Roger Gardner confirmed that the emissions inventory work was proceeding to time and [REDACTED] mentioned a meeting in September to examine early results from the modelling.

10. R3/T6 Project Plan: [REDACTED] noted that BAA were proposing to continue to use the 720,000 ATMs for R3 as the modelling assumption, although initial sighting shots for R3 suggested a maximum capacity of around 655,000 ATMs to stay within the noise contour limit. He noted that MM predictions had started off with a theoretical maximum (around 567,000 ATMs) and then been pared down to 540,000 to meet delay criteria and noise limits. But as the impact of delay or the 1 minute split issue was not yet

known, it seemed sensible to continue using 720,000 for the moment as the modelling assumption.

11. [REDACTED] was concerned that there might be political sensitivity around deviating from the White Paper. He explained that the current plan was based on TC4 (Terminal Concept 4), which was closest to White Paper assumptions, but suggested that there may need to be departures from this depending on results of consultation. David Gray suggested that it would be unwise to consult on something sub-optimal but close to the White Paper, only to regret this later if it constrained better options. He also mentioned that, in the Stansted context, the Courts had found the Department's policy conclusions to be unnecessarily prescriptive on the detailed configuration of the runways. Martin Capstick suggested that there were obvious advantages in staying close to the White Paper for consistency, but the priority should be to consult on something which was attractive and operationally beneficial in practice .

12. Martin Capstick emphasised the need to be in a position to go to Ministers in September with possible strategies for consultation.

#### **ITEM 5: CAA FEASIBILITY REPORT ON CURRENT ConOps**

13. [REDACTED] gave a summary of the high-level meeting on 9 August, which, it was agreed, had been a constructive meeting and had established a degree of shared understanding. The biggest issue remained the 1 minute departure splits, as the CAA would find it difficult to endorse something not compliant with ICAO standards. NATS said that they thought they could convince the CAA within one month that there was a workable solution that could meet ICAO standards. [REDACTED] noted that there was to be a further meeting on Friday 18 August where NATS and CAA would attempt to reach agreement.

**Action: NATS**

14. The second major issue was CDA. [REDACTED] reporting the outcome of the 9 August meeting, said that two actions had been agreed: to establish what the likely percentage of CDA arrivals would be with the current MM ConOps; and to look back to work done in 2002 and see how CDA was delivered and how we could amend the current ConOps to raise the percentage. BAA were to come back on this within a month. There were other issues needing further work, such as missed approach and traffic management, but these were regarded as less urgent and not critical for consultation.

**Action: BAA**

15. [REDACTED] said that if the CAA remained unpersuaded, the mitigation of safety issues would need to be done by rescheduling. This would mean that the capacity gain from MM would reduce from 160 ATM per day (at the 540,000 ATM per year level) to 140 ATM per day. This would, however, still fall within the range of the DfT 'Intermediate' Option (515,000) and the BAA

21. [REDACTED] outlined the BAA 'sighting shots' work, which looked at three MM scenarios, focussing particularly on how effective measures to improve aircraft emissions would be. The scenarios included one with Westerly Preference removed and one using 'Best Available Technology'. The results revealed only minimal changes and illustrated that aircraft issues alone would not solve the AQ problem; roads must be tackled. Roger Gardner also mentioned that the forthcoming AQEG report on NO<sub>2</sub> may be helpful.

**ITEM 8: AOB**

22. The next Project Board meeting would take place on **12 September at 1430.**

**AED3 August 2006**