

[REDACTED]

Airport Capacity Programme Board (ACPB)

17 January 2018

Attendees

Board Members		
Caroline Low (Chair)	Lucy Chadwick	Sacha Hatteea
Jack Goodwin	[REDACTED]	Farha Sheikh
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED] (for Philip Andrews)	Rupesh Mehta (from item 3)
Rosemary Hopkins	James Adutt	[REDACTED]
Brett Welch		
Other attendees		
[REDACTED] – item 3	[REDACTED] – item 3	[REDACTED] – item 4
[REDACTED] – item 5	[REDACTED] – items 7,8	[REDACTED] – items 7,8
[REDACTED] (Secretariat)	[REDACTED] (Secretariat)	[REDACTED] (observing)

Apologies	[REDACTED], Tim Stamp, Roger Jones, [REDACTED], [REDACTED], Tony Poulter, [REDACTED], Sarah Bishop, [REDACTED], Jill Adam, Philip Andrews
------------------	---

Note

1. Minutes & Actions

- 1.1. Caroline Low (CL) welcomed everyone to the meeting and noted apologies from the board. It was noted that a number of board members were supporting work related to recent announcements.
- 1.2. CL invited the board's responses to the minutes from the 12 December meeting to which there were none.
- 1.3. [REDACTED] ([REDACTED]) then pointed the board towards the action tracker, highlighting that a few actions were either planned for later in this meeting, such as updates on securing a positive vote for any NPS (Action 170817/1) and HAL engagement (Action 171212/6). The remaining actions are on track for subsequent presentation at future ACPB meetings, including an update on buses and coaches. Lucy Chadwick (LC) raised a query regarding an action considering HAL's proposed phasing of capacity and the implications of this (Action 170223/13), and the government position regarding 'lifting the cap' on Air Transport Movements (ATMs). Jack Goodwin (JG) agreed to take away this consideration and review public lines on this position.

Action 180117/1 Commercial team to clarify position regarding ATMs and proposed phasing of capacity.

2. Programme update

2.1. [REDACTED] introduced the Programme Dashboard, highlighting that further oral evidence sessions for the Transport Select Committee (TSC) on the revised draft Airports NPS are planned for 15 Jan and 5 Feb. [REDACTED] reported that c.11, 000 responses had been received to the further consultation on the revised draft Airport NPS, of which 8,500 are campaign responses. [REDACTED] highlighted that HAL's pre-DCO Consultation One (Con 1) launched on 17 Jan, of which a copy of the leaflet had been provided to board members. [REDACTED] also highlighted that as of 17 Jan the Heathrow Airport Consultative Committee will formally become the Community Engagement Board (CEB).

2.2. [REDACTED]

2.3. [REDACTED]

2.4. In the 'Programme KPIs' section of the dashboard, [REDACTED] highlighted that there were two new KPIs regarding ensuring DfT is content with the outline Heads of Terms agreed between HAL and HE in relation to the M25 works and regarding the completion of the Airports NPS assurances.

2.5. CL invited any questions from the board regarding the Programme Dashboard and [REDACTED]. In the 'Long-Term Delivery Milestones' section of the dashboard, [REDACTED] queried the shift of completion date for the HAL Masterplan from March to September 2018. JG clarified that the previous date was summer 2018, and that HAL expect to produce a 'single' masterplan on one option after responses to Con 1 have been analysed.

2.6. [REDACTED] introduced a new timeline that shows a high level snapshot of the key milestones to any NPS designation, in particular highlighting the recess periods for the House of Commons, and the TSC oral evidence sessions. Board members appreciated this clear, high level timeline. LC suggested a further revision of this timeline could be provided to the SoS to highlight possible comms opportunities (for example creation of ICCAN and rail market engagement).

Action 180117/3 Programme Office and Comms Team to work together to identify key comms opportunities in the progamme plan.

- 2.7. [REDACTED] presented the 'Key Decisions Forward Look' for the airport capacity programme. LC questioned the timeline for the rail market engagement and the expectation of the SoS for this to occur in March. CL noted that before the next bilat with the SoS a joint agreed position was needed on the timing of the market engagement exercise so this could be communicated to the SoS.

Action 180117/4 Rail Team to communicate timeline for rail market engagement to SoS.

- 2.8. [REDACTED] queried the feasibility of some work streams in terms of the number of board meetings within a month. [REDACTED] reported that the programme office was working with work stream leads to confirm the detailed arrangements.
- 2.9. [REDACTED] noted that in addition to the items in the Key Decisions Forward Look, an update on the programme would be provided to ExCo on 6 February. LC noted that she had recommended this given the number of decisions and activities planned for a short space of time and the limited windows for some activities given recess and purdah periods. LC noted that it will be helpful for ExCo to be aware of this.
- 2.10. [REDACTED] added that the Programme Office has been working with DfT Governance Division (Gavin Gaunt's team) to consider how a similar forward look document could be used alongside BICC decisions to help ensure that BICC has a view on dependencies between projects. This will be presented as a below the line paper to BICC on 5 February.

3. Communications update

- 3.1. [REDACTED] ([REDACTED]) circulated copies of the 'draft communications and engagement strategy' and apologised for not being able to include this within papers previously circulated. [REDACTED] asked for any questions regarding the December campaign activity related to the further consultation, to which there were none. [REDACTED] updated the board regarding the Department's comms plan for any reactive comment on HAL's Con 1. Areas had been leafleted and media pieces had been largely expected with a response from airlines mainly focussing on costs. An article had also been published regarding M25 disruption with quotes taken from an older report quoting Highways England.

Action 180117/5 Communications team to provide an electronic copy of the draft communications and engagement strategy.

- 3.2. [REDACTED] presented the paper to the board, highlighting the audiences that the strategy focused on including media coverage, airlines and MPs representing constituencies in the local area. [REDACTED] queried how effective the strategy would be at shifting the support of newspapers. [REDACTED] clarified that the strategy was not expected to completely change levels of support but rather temper the tone of coverage.
- 3.3. [REDACTED] highlighted the slide regarding harnessing policy levers, noting that some of the dates needed to be updated due to a push back of the Aviation Strategy. LC asked whether there was a conscious decision for the shift of these dates. CL

[REDACTED]

confirmed that it was due to a delay in the Aviation Strategy work (airport expansion did not drive the delay) and our communications strategy could be adjusted to fit these new timelines. RM suggested that some additional comms opportunities could be added in relating to noise and compensation.

3.4. [REDACTED]

Action 180117/6 Comms Team to return to the board in February with a shorter pack on the vote campaign.

4. HAL engagement and managing our priorities

4.1. [REDACTED] ([REDACTED]) and [REDACTED] ([REDACTED]) presented a paper to the board updating on the various different work streams approaching a critical point in the next few months. A common feature across these streams are that they require agreement or decision with HAL.

4.2. [REDACTED]

4.3. [REDACTED]

4.4. [REDACTED] CL also queried whether, in light of the number of work streams, resourcing levels were sufficient within the commercial team. [REDACTED] stated that, where possible, work had been contracted from DLA Piper and Rothschild to support the programme.

5. Future governance arrangements and update on assurance review of HAL's delivery plan

5.1. [REDACTED] ([REDACTED]) presented her paper regarding an update on the appointment of a consultant to undertake an assurance review of HAL's delivery plans in early 2018 and additionally, seeking steer on governance arrangements post any NPS designation.

5.2. [REDACTED] asked the board to note that the tender for the project delivery advisor contract went live on 16 January. The assurance review of HAL's delivery plans, which will underpin their masterplan, aims to give Government confidence that the preferred scheme is deliverable by 2030. [REDACTED]

Action 180117/7 Programme office to share the Routemap ToR with Lucy Chadwick.

- [REDACTED]
- 5.3. [REDACTED] queried what the adviser would be reviewing in March given that we don't expect HAL to 'fix' their masterplan until September 2018. [REDACTED] noted that we don't yet know what position HAL will take when they provide planning information to us, but our expectation is that this will include a central case scenario that could be reviewed.
- 5.4. LC noted that the adviser needs the experience and skills to be able to support the programme team in providing evidence to the SoS regarding deliverability of HAL's plan and in particular the level of confidence in HAL's current public milestone of runway opening by 2026.
- 5.5. [REDACTED] ([REDACTED]) queried what the scope of the PDA would be in respect to Highways England (HE). AS agreed that this point would be considered as part of the scope of the assurance review.
- 5.6. LC expressed concerns regarding HAL's willingness to commit to any future programme governance arrangements if these weren't agreed prior to any NPS designation. CL stated the intention of the Relationship Framework Document (RFD) was to make sure that this relationship was communicated correctly between DfT and HAL. [REDACTED] suggested that the RFD could include commitments to particular forums, such as the Programme Coordination Board (PCB). CL added that suggestions from HAL included greater engagement with Rail, post any designation.
- 5.7. BW queried the dates regarding the expectation for any runway opening date to fall 'within the late 2020s'. [REDACTED] clarified that the original date of an operational runway was 2026 (as per HAL's Statement of Principles document), whilst the draft NPS sets out the need for additional capacity by 2030. [REDACTED]
- 5.8. CL added that the assurance review work would report to the Commercial Steering Group (CSG) and ACPB.

Action 180117/8 Programme assurance review to be included as an agenda item within the March ACPB meeting.

6. Roads update

- 6.1. [REDACTED] ([REDACTED]) presented a brief update to the board, regarding the final Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between Highways England (HE) and HAL, and the commission of the Deliverability Report by HAL.
- 6.2. [REDACTED] noted that the MoU included within the January papers had now been signed by Jim O'Sullivan and John Holland Kaye. A copy of this would be circulated to the board in future.

6.3. CL queried progress on the remit letter and material on commercial structures that had been expected from HE in December. ■ noted that this material was expected to be reviewed at the Heathrow Strategic Roads Board in January.

6.4. BW questioned whether the slipping deadlines for the DBFO report was problematic for the programme. RM confirmed that the MoU and Heads of Term arrangements are being put in place to ensure risks and progress are managed effectively.

Action 180117/9 Roads update from next month to also include a copy of the M25 timeline

7. Rail update and SOBC for WRLtH

7.1. Farha Sheikh (FS), ■ (■) and ■ (■) presented a brief rail update and a summary paper for the SOBC for the proposed Western Rail Link to Heathrow (WRLtH). FS asked if there were any questions regarding the brief rail update. CL asked if Crossrail was still on track for May 2018 and requested that the Crossrail team contributes an update to future Rail Update papers for this board.

Action 180117/10 Surface Access Team to work with rail colleagues to include Crossrail update in future papers.

7.2. ■ presented the summary slides for the SOBC for WRLtH to the board and noted that the board should consider these slides in terms of how they relate to the Airport Capacity programme. She highlighted that the Heathrow Rail Access team will be seeking endorsement from BICC on 5 February to progress the scheme to OBC.

7.3. ■ asked the board to note that the SOBC for WRLtH had been viewed with an additional third runway, as well as with the existing two runways. ■

7.4. ■ asked board members to note that the Management Case highlights a large number of dependencies and complex interfaces with other major projects, in particular Project Hexagon. EC added that going forward the team was keen to bring HAL more closely into the governance for the Heathrow Rail Access Programme.

7.5. BW asked whether HAL was relying on the successful completion of WRLtH in order to meet environmental targets. ■ noted that different teams at HAL have different views on how important the scheme is to meeting environmental targets. RM clarified that it had been made clear to HAL that under both scenarios, with a WRLtH and without, the airport needs to demonstrate it can meet environmental commitments.

7.6. ■ (■) asked whether the DfT rail team had engaged with the rail Branch at HMT in relation to CP6 gateways. ■ noted she would look into this.

[REDACTED]

7.7. In relation to the market engagement exercise being planning for Southern and Western rail access, RH noted that Corporate finance was engaged with this work and that further consideration will be required on balance sheet treatment. It was noted that while balance sheet considerations were important, alternative delivery models could bring in other benefits such as greater efficiency and contestability, but it was important that whatever solution was chosen delivered value for money for the taxpayer.

8. AOB

8.1. CL thanked the board and asked if there was any other business or comments, to which there were none.