

[REDACTED]

Airport Capacity Programme Board (ACPB)

11 April 2018

Attendees

Board Members		
Caroline Low (Chair)	Sacha Hatteea	Philip Andrews
Tony Poulter	[REDACTED] (for Farha Sheikh)	Roger Jones
[REDACTED] (for [REDACTED])	[REDACTED] (Corporate Finance)	James Adutt
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED] (for Sarah Bishop)
Roger Jones	Jack Goodwin (video-in)	
Other attendees		
[REDACTED] / [REDACTED] (item 4)	[REDACTED] (item 5)	[REDACTED] (item 6)
Roger Jones (for [REDACTED], item 7 and 8)	[REDACTED] (item 9)	[REDACTED] / [REDACTED] (item 11)
[REDACTED] (observing)	[REDACTED] (observing)	[REDACTED] (Secretariat)
[REDACTED] (Secretariat)		

Apologies	[REDACTED], Lucy Chadwick, [REDACTED], [REDACTED], Jill Adam, Sarah Bishop, Farha Sheikh, Rupesh Mehta
------------------	--

Note

1. Minutes & Actions

1.1. Caroline Low (CL) welcomed everyone to the meeting and invited the board's responses to the minutes from the 14 March meeting to which there were none.

1.2. [REDACTED] () then pointed the board towards the action tracker, highlighting that; [REDACTED]; the Forward Look has been updated to incorporate suggestions received at the March Board; and HAL has been asked to provide a paper on Development Consent Order (DCO) modelling, (ID:180222/4) which will be presented at a future Programme Co-ordination Board (PCB).

2. Programme update

- 2.1. [REDACTED] drew the Board's attention to the dashboard, noting that the Transport Select Committee (TSC) report on the scrutiny of the revised draft NPS was published on 23rd March with 25 recommendations made. These are being considered by the team and advice prepared.
- 2.2. [REDACTED]
- 2.3. On the Key Decisions Forward Look, [REDACTED] commented that the teams provided a progress update to ExCo on 10th April. [REDACTED] outlined future BICC meetings scheduled for 23rd April and 3rd May, which will feature the Statutory Blight Contract and Updated SOBC respectively. *(Post meeting note: both papers will now go to BICC for the 3rd May meeting).*
- 2.4. Roger Jones (RJ) commented that the reference to Project Hexagon in the Forward Look will need to be removed once the contract is signed next week.
- 2.5. CL noted that she would like there to be a 'special' Programme Board meeting in the summer, where the Board considers its role in the next phase. She also noted that the team is considering adding more delivery/technical expertise to the Board.

ACTION 180411/1: ACPB Secretariat and PMO to arrange Programme Board Special Meeting.

3. Assurance Review of HAL's Delivery Plan

- 3.1. CL introduced [REDACTED] ([REDACTED]) and [REDACTED] ([REDACTED]) from Costain to the board on the subject of their role as Programme Delivery Advisor.
- 3.2. [REDACTED] commented to the Board that the scope of the early assurance review is to assess HAL's delivery schedule, to determine whether an operational runway is deliverable by 2026. [REDACTED] briefly discussed the areas of focus for the final report, which will be completed by the end of April. [REDACTED] confirmed that progress to date has been positive, 11 meetings have concluded with HAL, and whenever information has been requested from HAL, they have been open and collaborative. [REDACTED] commented that the final meeting will be taking place later this week.
- 3.3. [REDACTED] ([REDACTED]) asked to what extent the different plan options impact the delivery schedule and findings of the work. [REDACTED] noted that all options have a similar critical path and total duration.
- 3.4. Tony Poulter (TP) asked whether the report will be shared with HAL. CL said it was anticipated that they would be given the opportunity to comment. TP asked whether Costain's role is to emphasise risk elements or give a balanced assessment on strengths and risks in HAL's delivery plans. [REDACTED] emphasised that the main focus is to assess delivery confidence of HAL's proposal whilst flagging all areas of risk. James Adutt (JA) asked whether the report will be made publicly

[REDACTED]

available, to which CL responded that it is recognised that it may well be disclosable.

3.5. [REDACTED]

3.6. [REDACTED]

4. Rail update

4.1. [REDACTED] ([REDACTED]) provided an update on rail activities. She noted that the Project Hexagon agreement is due to be signed in w/c 16th April and there has been minimal press pick up on this. (Post meeting note: Agreements signed on 17 April). [REDACTED] noted that conclusion of this agreement has removed the dependency of the Langley Depot from the HS2 Programme and allows the Western Rail link to Heathrow team to proceed with their OBC.

4.2. TP asked if there had been much interest in the market led proposals for Western and Southern Rail. [REDACTED]

4.3. [REDACTED]

5. Communications update

5.1. CL introduced [REDACTED] ([REDACTED]) to present the communications update to the board. [REDACTED] provided an update on the latest communications engagement strategy.

5.2. [REDACTED] highlighted that the communications team has conducted some initial parliamentary social media analysis, the purpose of which was to better understand how MPs are engaging with the issue of airport capacity ahead of any decision on designation. [REDACTED] commented that the findings highlighted the most talked about topics online regarding the scheme are 'scheme design' referring to runway length and location and 'environmental impacts.' [REDACTED] cited that with opposition voices gaining more traction in social media on the campaign, it is important to use our upcoming engagement with MPs to increase the number of supportive voices.

5.3. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

5.4. In terms of upcoming stakeholder activity, [REDACTED] reported that roundtable meetings are being lined up between the Aviation Minister, businesses and local authorities, on the 11th and 22nd May respectively.

5.5. [REDACTED] advised the board that the slidepack for this communications item will be circulated to the Board following the meeting, for reference and any comments.

5.6. Jack Goodwin (JG) asked how rail announcements were included in the Comms Plan. [REDACTED] confirmed that there is joint working with Rail Group on this. JG also noted that the 'Summary Document' being produced will be key for MP engagement later in the year.

5.7. RJ noted that a key message to make clear is 'what an NPS is' and 'what it isn't'. Sacha Hatteea (SH) added that it has been apparent in the TSC process and in the consultation responses that there is a lack of understanding on this point and that this will be addressed in the opening speech by the Secretary of State when any NPS is debated, if Ministers decide to proceed.

6. [REDACTED]

6.1. [REDACTED]

6.2. [REDACTED]

6.3. [REDACTED]

6.4. [REDACTED]

6.5. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

6.6. [REDACTED]

7. Aviation Industry Contribution to Rail Schemes

7.1 Roger Jones (RJ) introduced the section relating to securing the aviation industry contribution for the Western Rail Link to Heathrow (WRLtH) project. RJ commented that the assumption is that the WRLtH project will only happen if an appropriate contribution is received from the Heathrow aviation industry to the construction costs.

7.2 RJ set out the proposed approach, principles for funding negotiations and the timescales for this work.

7.3 [REDACTED]

7.4 RJ highlighted to the board that the Heathrow Rail Access Client Team have been working with Nichols/Agilia to develop a market engagement strategy for WRLtH and stated that this work is nearing completion.

7.5 [REDACTED]

7.6 SH asked about the scheme options being used in the WRLtH Business Case. JG replied that HAL are continuing to develop their scheme design options in parallel to the business case work. [REDACTED] added that Network Rail and HAL are working closely to ensure both parties are aligned on scheme option development.

7.7 [REDACTED]

7.8 [REDACTED] asked how this work will be resourced. RJ stated there will be joint team comprising of Rail Group, Airport Capacity and legal colleagues.

ACTION 180411/3: Surface Access teams to document market engagement assumptions.

8. Project Hexagon – (see Rail update, section 4 above)

9. Roads Update

9.1. Philip Andrews (PA) updated the Board on the presentation delivered to BICC on 9th April regarding the HAL/HE Outline Heads of Terms (HoTs). PA noted that a

key aspect discussed with BICC was CAA engagement in the M25 proposals. PA added that BICC has asked the team to return with options for reaching agreement on the HoTs. CL noted that the PMO can offer support on scheduling in a return to BICC.

9.2. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] CL asked, leaving these two areas aside, how the HoTs was progressing. PA confirmed that the rest of the documents have broadly been agreed.

9.3. CL queried the governance the HoTs has been through at HAL. [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED] stated the team understand that there is a HAL Board meeting on the 16th
 April where the HoT's will be discussed. [REDACTED]

9.4. PA noted that the next Heathrow Strategic Roads Board was on the 23rd April but there may need to be regular communications between teams ahead of this date.

10. HAL engagement update and NPS dependencies

10.1. [REDACTED] gave apologies from [REDACTED] and talked the Board through the NPS dependencies paper highlighting the agreements and assurances to be completed by the end of April. The Board noted the update and that time was quite tight to complete the various workstreams by the end of April.

11. Blight Contract update

11.1. [REDACTED] ([REDACTED]) and [REDACTED] ([REDACTED]) provided a verbal update to the Board on the blight contract negotiations.

11.2. [REDACTED] noted that the team has undertaken some work with HS2 and the CAA on costs for blight and the CAA has consulted on a £15-20 million cost range. [REDACTED]

11.3. [REDACTED] asked to what extent will the blight offer be promoted by HAL and will communities be aware. [REDACTED]

- 11.4. [REDACTED] stated that there is one substantive issue remaining and that this relates to liability for VAT. This only applies to businesses rather than houses and the team is working on this with tax lawyers.
- 11.5. [REDACTED] noted that the contract would be finalised in the next two weeks and that the team would be presenting to BICC.
- 11.6. CL asked if the team knew when HAL would be taking the contract through their governance. The team took this point away.

ACTION 180411/4: Communities Team to understand when HAL's governance will be considering the blight contract.

11.7 SH asked whether the team has now got a detailed red line map from HAL which would define the boundaries for blight claims. [REDACTED] ([REDACTED]) confirmed that the team were still following this up with HAL as a priority.

12. IPA Governance Study

- 12.1. [REDACTED] talked the board through the paper, setting out the key findings and recommendations from the initial IPA Project Initiation Routemap study on governance for the next phase of the programme. [REDACTED] noted that the outputs of the study have informed the governance section of the Relationship Framework Document (RFD) which is currently being drafted.
- 12.2. [REDACTED] noted that the IPA had conducted a series of interviews with DfT, HAL and the CAA to inform their study and that two workshops had been held to agree the outputs between DfT and HAL. [REDACTED] stated that the study focused on governance between DfT and HAL and that broader aspects of governance would be considered under the full Routemap study, which is planned for later in the year (autumn 2018).
- 12.3. [REDACTED] commented that the actions from the study would be taken forward between July and September. These include re-establishing the Programme Coordination Board (PCB) and conducting a review of the sub-boards that sit under PCB.
- 12.4. [REDACTED] ([REDACTED]) noted that the IPA has been asked to support the airspace modernisation programme in further developing their governance arrangements. JG noted that the relationship between the programme and the airspace modernisation work will need to be even stronger going forward and welcomed the support from the IPA.
- 12.5. [REDACTED] enquired about action 4 in the paper, regarding third party support. [REDACTED] explained that his point relates to considering whether some consultant support / training may be beneficial for helping to build constructive relationships between parties. JG added that [REDACTED] had asked the team to consider this point too. [REDACTED] noted that Rail Group colleagues have carried out some similar work to build relationships between DfT and Network Rail. [REDACTED] commented that she could provide some contacts to liaise with.

[REDACTED]

12.6. JG added that the CAA had accepted their ongoing role in programme governance and [REDACTED]

13.AOB

13.1. [REDACTED] thanked the team for the copies of recent ExCo and BICC papers and commented that these were high quality.