

MINUTES - Meeting of the Airport Commission

25th March 2013 10.00 – 13.00, Sanctuary Buildings

Attendees	
Sir Howard Davies (SirHD)	Chair of the Commission
Sir John Armitt (SirJA)	Member of the Commission
Geoff Muirhead (GM)	Member of the Commission
Professor Dame Julia King (ProfDJK)	Member of the Commission
Professor Ricky Burdett (ProfRB)	Member of the Commission
Phil Graham (PG)	Secretariat
	Secretariat
	Secretariat
	Secretariat
	Secretariat
	Secretariat

Item	Notes
1. Miscellaneous (diary management, catch-up from previous meeting)	<p><u>ACTION Programme team</u> to devise and circulate to Commissioners a weekly update on diary arrangements, highlighting weekly changes in red.</p> <p><u>ACTION SirHD</u> to suggest possible dates for a dinner for Commissioners and PG.</p> <p><u>ACTION Programme team</u> to circulate link to APF</p> <p><u>ACTION Programme team</u> to consider the feasibility for one of Commission meetings to be held at a venue under the LHR flight path</p> <p><u>ACTION Prog team</u> to circulate slides from BA presentation to all Commissioners</p> <p><u>ACTION PG & [REDACTED]</u> to find and circulate a more comprehensive map of LHR global network, for potential inclusion in hub paper</p>
2. Comms	<p>Public evidence sessions</p> <p>Discussion on format and timing. Agreement that electronic and social media should be used to make sessions accessible to the public (stream, tweet, podcast etc)</p> <p>Agreement that the sessions should include the Commission, witnesses giving evidence & an audience of invited stakeholders. Witnesses will be asked to make a short presentation, to be followed by questions from the Commission, with audience questions if time allows.</p> <p>Agreement that London and Manchester should each host a session (Manchester 9th July, London 10th July). Sessions be based around the themes of the discussion</p>

		<p>papers.</p> <p>ACTION ■ & Programme team to explore organising public evidence sessions as above.</p> <p>ACTION ■ to amend comms strategy paragraph 2 'aiming for consensus on our <i>approach</i>'</p> <p>Agreement that the second proposed Scotland meeting should take place at Secretariat level.</p> <p>ACTION ■ to organise this second Scotland meeting [NB: being arranged for 5th June]</p> <p>Agreement that Commission should hold a half day meeting with the Regional Cities (ie the 8 biggest cities outside of London)</p> <p>ACTION ■ to organise Regional Cities meeting</p> <p>Agreement that there are five gaps in the stakeholder engagement programme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manufacturers • Low cost and pt-to-pt airlines • International airlines • Aviation alliances • European Commission <p>ACTION ■ & Programme team to find ways to fill these gaps.</p> <p>ACTION ■ to give more thought to attendance at the Thames Estuary visit.</p> <p>ACTION ■ to pick up ■ work on public opinion, summarise and circulate to Commissioners</p>
3.	Hub paper	<p>ACTION ■ to update paper to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • explain that the London hub model is unique comparative to other global hubs • chapter 4 - describe costs as well as benefits • discuss whether hubs are sustainable models in the long term • explore what is the maximum viable size of a hub? Are there diseconomies of scale beyond a certain number of runways? E.g. would any new hub need to be infinitely expandable or would 4 runways be the natural limit? Atlanta could be a good case study, also Via Milano at Milan Malpensa airport. • discuss hours of operation, use Frankfurt as a case study • include references to all themes, even if only to say its covered elsewhere. <p>ACTION ■ & PG Look for data to demonstrate whether UK capacity constraints impose a cost on passengers (we have anecdotal evidence that travel from UK is more</p>

		<p>expensive but we need hard data) <u>ACTION PG</u> to circulate Oxera paper on financing Estuary options</p>
4.	Sift criteria	<p>Agreement that publication will remain in April, but could be later than the proposed date of April 19th (public commitment made to 'in the Spring'). <u>ACTION</u> ■ to review points in submissions against current criteria and prepare paper for April publication. <u>ACTION</u> ■ review coverage of these issues in current draft criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surface access & investment (who pays?) • Passenger experience • Safety (should be referenced explicitly under operational viability) • Relative CO2 effects • Competition (as a bullet point under economy) • Add timescale to 'future demand' under 'accessibility' • Air quality – should cover both local surface transport and aviation • Strategic fit – stress international element • Need for scheme promoters to explain assumptions (e.g. technological development) underpinning environmental calculations <p><u>ACTION</u> ■ to include in paper detail of sifting process, e.g. expertise available to Commission – including role of technical advisors and External Advisory Panel</p> <p>Agreement that commercially sensitive information and any detailed plans should be considered confidential when we publish material.</p> <p><u>ACTION</u> ■ to include an explanation of plans for publication including treatment of confidential information in sift document.</p> <p>Discussion of the sifting model and agreement on the importance of quality assuring assumptions made in submissions (both tasks for the consultants working on the long term options).</p>
5.	Expert Panel	<p><u>ACTION</u> ■ to add ■ to the list of proposed Panel members</p> <p><u>ACTION</u> ■ to consider how gaps in expertise can be addressed in future rounds of panel recruitment – e.g.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Urban and Infrastructure Planning

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • International <p><u>ACTION</u> ■ to consider need for security expertise and Sir JA to provide recently retired contact from CPNI</p>
6	Assessment of Need paper	Agreement to approach to Assessment of Need outlined in circulated paper.
7.	Climate Change paper	<p><u>ACTION</u> ■ to make some amendments to draft:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • replace 'likely conclusions' with 'possible conclusions' or similar • be less assumptive/more cautious in biofuels sections • amend presentation of CRT graph to be clearer that this was an aspiration of a previous government, not a target. Show that there are no sectoral targets