

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Airport Capacity Programme Board (ACPB)

21 February 2018

Attendees

Board Members		
Jack Goodwin (Chair)	Sarah Bishop	Sacha Hatteea
Tony Poulter	[REDACTED]	Farha Sheikh
[REDACTED]	Philip Andrews	[REDACTED]
Rosemary Hopkins	James Adutt	[REDACTED]
Brett Welch	Jill Adam	[REDACTED]
Roger Jones	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
Other attendees		
[REDACTED] – item 3	[REDACTED] – item 3	[REDACTED] – item 6
[REDACTED] – item 6	[REDACTED] – item 7	[REDACTED] – item 8
[REDACTED] – item 8	[REDACTED] (Secretariat)	[REDACTED] (Secretariat)

Apologies	[REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], Jill Adam, Philip Andrews, Caroline Low, Lucy Chadwick, Rupesh Mehta, [REDACTED]
------------------	--

Note

1. Minutes & Actions

- 1.1. Jack Goodwin (JG) welcomed everyone to the meeting and noted apologies from the board including Caroline Low (CL) [REDACTED].
- 1.2. JG invited the board's responses to the minutes from the 17 January meeting to which there were none.
- 1.3. JG introduced [REDACTED] to give a brief update on the additional oral evidence session for the Transport Select Committee (TSC) on the 20 February at which representatives from the airlines and Andrew Haines (CAA) gave evidence. [REDACTED] reported that the airlines voiced their position on costs and stated views that the NPS should be amended to include affordability criteria. Willie Walsh (IAG) gave strong opinions on cost, but did voice support for expansion at Heathrow. [REDACTED] stated that Andrew Haines (CAA) was asked his opinion on the extent of powers that the CAA have over enforcing competition and to force the break-up of an asset, Andrew told the TSC that waiting for Parliamentary time to give the CAA extra powers would not be in the consumers interest, as additional airport capacity in the SE is required urgently. Sacha Hatteea (SH) stated that his

team were going to provide the TSC with additional information, setting out the difference between the regulatory and planning systems.

- 1.4. JG invited [REDACTED] to update the board on Client Earth's air quality court ruling, in which the judge declared inadequate the plans to tackle air pollution in 45 local authority areas. The judge ordered ministers to require local authorities to investigate and identify measures to tackle illegal levels of pollution in 45 towns and cities as soon as possible. On the other two counts that Client Earth was contesting, the judge found that the modelling of air pollution is compliant with regulations and that the government's approach to areas with major air quality problems (such as London) is 'sensible, rational and lawful'. The ruling did not appear to impact upon the programme. [REDACTED] asked if there would be more appeals to this ruling, of which [REDACTED] replied there were none expected.
- 1.5. [REDACTED] then pointed the board towards the action tracker, highlighting that all but three actions had been achieved and the remaining actions were on track for subsequent presentation at future ACPB meetings, including an update on buses and coaches from the surface access team (Action 17108/4) and a programme assurance review update planned for March (Action 180117/8).

2. Programme update

- 2.1. [REDACTED] introduced the Programme Dashboard, highlighting that bids were being evaluated for a Project Delivery Advisors contract to undertake an independent review of HAL's delivery plans with an expectation to award the contract by the end of February. [REDACTED] then drew the board's attention to the 'Programme KPIs' section of the dashboard, [REDACTED].
- 2.2. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] Within the 'Programme Resources' section of the dashboard, [REDACTED] stated that the number of staff in AC PMO had increased to reflect recent recruitment.
- 2.3. JG introduced SH to give a brief update on the oral evidence sessions for the TSC. SH reported that clarifications were required within three areas; noise, domestic connectivity, and air quality. These would be sent to the TSC within the next week.
- 2.4. Rosemary Hopkins (RH) queried a change of date in the 'Long-Term Delivery Milestones' section of the dashboard regarding HAL's submission of DCO application to Winter 19/20. JG informed the board that HAL had updated the airlines that they expected their application for development consent to be submitted in January 2020 (if the Government decides to designate a final Airports NPS). Given the Department has not officially received an update from HAL to reflect this change the programme is using a range for the milestone until assurance of HAL's plans has been completed.

- 2.5. [REDACTED] presented the 'Key Decision Forward Look' for the airport capacity programme. [REDACTED] highlighted the revised version that had been included in the papers. Within the documents, [REDACTED] asked the board to note the governance route for the HAL/HE Heads of Terms and stated that this decision may need to be brought to ACPB by correspondence between March and April, to fit programme timelines.

Action 180221/1 Programme management office to update sub-committee papers route on 'Key Decisions Forward Look' for the March meeting.

- 2.6. [REDACTED] queried whether the Programme Management Office had considered a forward look for decisions in the event of any NPS designation, as the document only plans until May.

Action 180221/2 Programme management office to include key decisions post any NPS designation in the Key Decisions Forward Look.

3. Communications update

- 3.1. JG introduced [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] to present the communications update to the board. [REDACTED] asked the board to note that the paper circulated was an update of the paper presented at the January ACPB meeting and had been presented to the Secretary of State on 19 February.

- 3.2. [REDACTED] highlighted that the paper was a 'draft communications and engagement strategy' to prepare for a House of Commons vote on any potential final NPS. In terms of upcoming stakeholder activity, [REDACTED] reported that a meeting between the Aviation Minister and key local community groups around Heathrow, including Teddington Action Group, Stop Heathrow Expansion and HACAN, has been planned for 8 March. A visit for the Aviation Minister to Newcastle Airport as part of Global North Week was also planned for 23 February, with further events planned in Liverpool, Scotland and Belfast. A further routable with local authorities was planned for May.

- 3.3. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] asked if it was possible to discuss a day by day plan for parliamentary handling. [REDACTED] agreed to follow up directly with the ACP Strategy and Policy team and Cabinet Office on this.

- 3.4. [REDACTED] noted that Parliamentary handling should be seen as twofold: i) managing the TSC process ii) any process in the run up to, and during the laying of any final Airports NPS. SH agreed, confirming the Department was currently concentrated on managing the TSC process. Tony Poulter (TP) noted that the TSCs would be a good opportunity to get messages out on a national level, though ministers are restrained by propriety guidance within the Statement of Approach (SoA). Brett Welch (BW) asked whether a plan existed to consider at which point Ministers could publicly comment on expansion. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

4. Rail update

- 4.1. Farha Sheikh (FS) presented a brief rail update to the board, highlighting progress made on the market engagement strategy, the Strategic Outline Business Case (SOBC) for Western Rail Line to Heathrow (WRLtH) and Southern Rail Line to Heathrow (SRLtH). A contract has been awarded to Nichols/Agilia who will be led by senior industry figure Peter Hansford to develop a strategy for market engagement and implementation plan for both WRLtH and SRLtH. FS asked the board to note that the market engagement would run for approximately 6 weeks, beginning in mid-March. The WRLtH SOBC was approved by BICC on 5 February, with the aim to deliver a WRLtH OBC by the end of the year.
- 4.2. TP asked whether the approach to market testing for WRLtH and SRLtH were being considered separately. ■■■ said that this point was being considered by the Nicholls team as part of their work.
- 4.3. ■■■ asked whether HAL's contribution to WRLtH had been agreed and whether the query regarding further consideration required on balance sheet treatment, raised at the last meeting, had been considered. ■■■ stated that he would be happy to discuss these issues offline. ■■■ stated that a paper was being prepared for ACPB on the approach to defining and negotiating HAL's contribution to WRLtH.
- 4.4. RH queried whether the extension of the CH2M contract was sufficient business case support or whether further resourcing was required. She also stated that the governance routes for rail may also need to be considered through correspondence, given the short timescales.
- 4.5. JG invited ■■■ to give a brief update on Project Hexagon. ■■■ stated that a negotiating strategy had been agreed following a review of the business case at BICC, and a series of senior escalation meetings were scheduled for early March. A meeting had been agreed for the Secretary of State with Lord Deighton for 7 March, with the plan for an agreement to be in place by 16 March. ■■■
■■■
■■■
■■■.
- ■■■
- 4.6. JG agreed that it would be optimal to have a representative from Project Hexagon in attendance at the board.
- 4.7. FS asked for an explanation of the ramifications to WRLtH if Project Hexagon did not go ahead, and what this ultimately may mean for the Airport Capacity Programme. ■■■

5. Roads update

5.1. Philip Andrews (PA) presented a brief update paper to the board. He stated that the key point of the paper was updating the board on the Outline Heads of Terms framework (OHoT), planned to be agreed by April, that will set out the principal responsibilities and commercial arrangements between HE and HAL in relation to the M25 works.

5.2. [REDACTED]

5.3. [REDACTED]

6. Post adoption statement approach

6.1. [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] presented a paper on the post adoption statement. [REDACTED] stated that the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Directive requires that when a plan or programme (such as a National Policy Statement) is adopted, a Post Adoption Statement (PAS) is published. In preparation for the designation of any final Airports NPS, WSP (environmental experts) have been commissioned to produce a draft post adoption statement.

6.2. [REDACTED] opened up to the board for any questions regarding the approach to the PAS so far and its relationship to other NPS-related documents. [REDACTED] thanked both for a clear and concise paper, but queried the lack of feature within the key decisions forward look. .

Action 180221/5 Programme office to consider including the Post Adoption Statement as part of the Key Decisions Forward Look.

7. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

7.1. [REDACTED]

7.2. [REDACTED]

7.3. [REDACTED]

8. Shared vision and objectives

8.1. [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] presented part 1 of their paper on shared vision and objectives and benefit profiling. [REDACTED] reported that ACP is engaging with HAL on a shared vision and set of objectives to frame the Relationship Framework Document (RFD) with benefit profiling activity to support this work. [REDACTED] stated that a meeting was held between Caroline Low and Emma Gilthorpe in January to agree these objectives in principle. Some changes have since been requested by HAL following review from by their board. [REDACTED] asked the board for their views on the changes suggested by HAL.

8.2. [REDACTED] asked for a clarification regarding the change to the 'economy objective'. TP queried how long-term private sector investment would be secured in other large UK infrastructure projects as the objective could suggest. [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] noted and will review.

8.3. SB questioned the 'Community and Environment' objective's wording to mitigate environmental impacts 'as far as possible'. [REDACTED]

8.4. SB suggested some objectives could be more consistent with the Aviation Strategy in regards to sustainable journeys and minimising the environmental impacts.

8.5. [REDACTED]

- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- 8.6. Brett Welch (BW) queried the wording 'more sustainable journeys', as this seemed to imply that this objective could be achieved with a single additional journey. [REDACTED]

- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- 8.7. SH asked how long the objectives would be in effect for. [REDACTED] answered that currently the RFD stated that the framework would remain in place 'until benefits are fully realised', [REDACTED]

Action 180221/7 Benefits management team to consider suggestions from the board.

9. AOB

- 9.1. JG asked [REDACTED] if he would like the board to address questions raised earlier in the meeting regarding the Secretary of State's appearance at the TSC and the balance sheet implications of WRLtH. SH proposed circulating the transcript of the TSC oral session on 7 February to clarify evidence given by the Secretary of State. RH added that, with regards to the second question, work is ongoing with Network Rail on balance sheet implications and she would be able to send [REDACTED] more information on this.

Action 180221/8 Transcript for Secretary of State commitment to WRLtH at oral evidence session for TSC on 7 February to be circulated to ACPB members.

- 9.2. SB raised that she had some suggestions for the benefit profiling work and would send these to [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] separately.

Action 180221/9 Board members to provide additional comments for benefit profiling work to [REDACTED] and [REDACTED].