

Heathrow Expansion Board (HEB)

11<sup>th</sup> July 2018

**Attendees**

<b>Board Members</b>	Caroline Low	Sacha Hatteea	Rupesh Mehta
	[REDACTED]	Jack Goodwin	Brett Welch
	Sarah Bishop	[REDACTED]	Tony Poulter
	[REDACTED]	Roger Jones	James Adutt
	Stuart White		
<b>Attendance for specific items</b>	[REDACTED] (item 2)	[REDACTED] (item 4)	[REDACTED] (item 5)
	[REDACTED] (item 7)	[REDACTED] (items 4 & 6)	
<b>Secretariat / Observers</b>	[REDACTED] (Secretariat)	[REDACTED] (Secretariat)	
<b>Apologies</b>	[REDACTED]		

**Note**

**1. Minutes and Actions**

- 1.1. Caroline Low (CL) welcomed everyone to the meeting and noted that this was Sacha Hatteea (SH) and Rupesh Mehta's (RM) last attendance at ACPB. CL also welcomed Stuart White (SW) who has taken over from Farah Sheikh (FS) as the Deputy Director for Heathrow Rail Schemes.
- 1.2. CL invited the Board's comments on the minutes from the 6 June meeting. [REDACTED] highlighted that, in point 2.3, an update on how MPs might vote was now redundant given the successful vote and designation of the NPS.
- 1.3. James Adutt (JAd) queried on Action 180606/05 what aspects of road delivery were included in the HE/HAL Heads of Terms JAd and RM agreed to discuss offline.
- 1.4. [REDACTED] took the Board through the Actions Tracker, and noted that action 180314/7 regarding the Transport Focus Research would be presented at today's Board. Action 180606/5 would also be presented to the Board by [REDACTED] and it was noted that this action could impact on action 180606/6 to liaise with the BICC Secretariat on a possible earlier slot for the HE/HAL M25 Heads of Terms. A date however, is currently being held with BICC on 24 September.

[REDACTED]

1.5. [REDACTED] also highlighted that most actions present in the Tracker were due for follow up at subsequent Boards, including action 180509/7 which is scheduled to be presented for presentation at the September Board.

1.6. CL invited any further comments – none were provided.

## 2. Programme update

2.1. [REDACTED] provided a programme update from the dashboard and noted that the NPS had been designated on 26 June.

2.2. [REDACTED] noted that the Programme is transitioning into a new structure, and the 17 vacant posts highlighted in the “Programme Resources” section of the dashboard was artificially high as it included both pre-transition and post-transition vacancies. CL asked the team to double-check these figures given recent changes in the team.

2.3. [REDACTED]

2.4. [REDACTED]

2.5. Responding to [REDACTED] question, [REDACTED] noted that a number of Western Rail Access issues had been progressed in recent months, including Project Hexagon, the completion of the Western Rail SOBC and Network Rail’s recent consultation. [REDACTED]

2.6. [REDACTED]

2.7. Jack Goodwin (JG) responded to [REDACTED] comments on ACAP 017 by explaining that Heathrow Airport Limited (HAL) are content with the Programme’s progress, in particular, the delivery of a designated NPS.. [REDACTED]

2.8. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

2.9. [REDACTED]

2.10. [REDACTED]

2.11. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

2.12. [REDACTED] noted to the Board that all pre-designation items on the Governance Forward Look document would be removed ahead of the next meeting in August.

2.13. [REDACTED] confirmed that the governance decisions were on track in line with the Forward Look document, and that the M25 Heads of Terms will now be going to BICC on 24 September.

2.14. JG mentioned to the Board that item 15 (HAL Initial Business Plan) needs to be revisited as it did not go to PCB in June for an early review. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

**Action 180711/2: [REDACTED] and JG to re-visit HAL Initial Business Plan on the Governance Forward Look document.**

2.15. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

2.16. [REDACTED] took the Board through the BICC/ExCo Forward Look. CL highlighted the Airport Capacity Update on the 12 July to the DfT Board.

2.17. JG mentioned that it would be useful to organise a trip to Heathrow for ExCo members in the future. CL noted that this was a good idea.

[REDACTED]

2.18. [REDACTED]

2.19. BW asked if the [REDACTED] (paper 49.7) was going to appear in the papers for the DfT Board meeting on 12 July. TP confirmed that it was not in papers submitted to the Board. CL mentioned that it would be worth taking a copy along just in case.

### 3. Communications Update

3.1. [REDACTED] began his update by highlighting how eventful the last few weeks had been for the Programme and especially the period between the laying and designating of the NPS. [REDACTED] also highlighted the amount of documents that needed publishing on the Gov.uk website and thanked the team for their huge effort.

3.2. [REDACTED] proceeded to inform the Board that after laying the NPS and publication of other documents, it became apparent that we needed to target activity on key regions. From this, many op-eds were written and a large number of Ministerial visits were scheduled.

3.3. [REDACTED] mentioned to the Board that a vast amount of stakeholder engagement was critical, and noted that many MPs were quoting major stakeholders in the final debate.

3.4. [REDACTED] proceeded to highlight the large majority that the NPS had received, and although the SNP did not vote in favour, [REDACTED] pressed that the Scotland effort was not wasted. [REDACTED] mentioned that around 25% of Labour support for the NPS came from the North West, thus the team were right to focus on the North.

3.5. [REDACTED] outlined the next steps for the Comms team following the success of their last campaign. [REDACTED] described a new Aviation Campaign with three pillars focussing on Airport Expansion, Airspace Modernisation and the proposed new Aviation Strategy.

3.6. [REDACTED] proceeded to ask the Board if they had any questions. TP and Roger Jones (RJ) both congratulated [REDACTED] and his team on their success and hard work.

3.7. Sacha Hatteea (SH) highlighted that a key area of focus for communications and stakeholder engagement will continue to be regional connectivity.

3.8. In response to SH's point, [REDACTED] mentioned how a stakeholder engagement map had been produced, and how the majority of engagement had been conducted outside the South East, showing the level of focus outside of London.

#### 4. Rail Update

- 4.1. [REDACTED] started by noting to the Board that rail market engagement was still ongoing, with the last of the meetings due to finish on 20 July. [REDACTED] also noted that results from the exercise would be published in the autumn.
- 4.2. [REDACTED] mentioned that the Statutory Consultation for the Western Rail Link to Heathrow (WRLtH) is complete. [REDACTED] highlighted that there is significant support for the scheme, but there are concerns over local traffic issues.
- 4.3. SH enquired what the reasons were for concerns over local traffic. In response, [REDACTED] outlined that as part of the WRLtH, a road would have to be closed under the Great Western Mainline, and local authorities were concerned about managing this. [REDACTED] also noted that there was a local proposal for a new relief road in the Iwer area but that Network Rail only needed to introduce mitigations that were proportionate to the impact that WRLtH has on local traffic.
- 4.4. RJ highlighted to the Board that he and [REDACTED] will be meeting with Slough and South Bucks to discuss the local traffic issues. [REDACTED] also added that the team are working with Network Rail to ensure there is no conflict between WRLtH and HAL's DCO application.
- 4.5. TP asked what the early feedback has been on Southern Rail Link to Heathrow (SRLtH). [REDACTED] outlined that there has been lots of engagement from the known southern scheme promoters and some questions about the potential for delivering both WRLtH and SRLtH.
- 4.6. [REDACTED] highlighted that WRLtH would be going to BICC on 24 September. TP recommended that [REDACTED] develops multiple scenarios and possible actions before the Board meetings.

#### 5. Roads Update:

- 5.1. [REDACTED]
- 5.2. [REDACTED] asked about the scope of the update provided by [REDACTED] and whether this covered all roads (i.e. the Strategic Road Network and local roads around Heathrow), or solely Strategic Roads (i.e. only the Strategic Road Network). [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] agreed to take this discussion offline.
- 5.3. [REDACTED]

- 5.4. [REDACTED] RJ also noted that inevitably, there will always be new issues as old ones are resolved. [REDACTED] agreed and further highlighted to the Board that the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) will also need to be engaged too.
- 5.5. CL mentioned that a letter is being drafted from the Secretary of State to HAL following the publication of the RFD, showing a definite refresh in the relationship between the Department and HAL.
- 5.6. [REDACTED] highlighted that [REDACTED] will first be meeting with the Executive Director of Highways England; the letter is yet to be approved by Highways England and the CAA.

## 6. Buses and Coaches Update

- 6.1. Roger Jones (RJ) started by explaining to the Board that this update follows two earlier presentations to the Board.
- 6.2. RJ highlighted that there are two major parts to the Transport Focus work: qualitative and quantitative work. RJ explained to the Board that this update will focus on the qualitative piece, with a further update to come in September on both pieces.
- 6.3. RJ explained that there have been interesting messages from the qualitative piece, and that the quantitative piece will further test this. RJ highlighted that there has been a lot of wide interest in this work, and that there will be a discussion on how this is taken forward in September.
- 6.4. Rupesh Mehta (RM) explained that bus and coach access play an extremely important part in HAL's Surface Access plans.
- 6.5. Sacha Hatteea (SH) expressed that there was nothing surprising in the results, but asked how we plan to instigate HAL's behavioural change. RJ noted that HAL have funded the Transport Focus research, and are keen to push this agenda.
- 6.6. [REDACTED]
- 6.7. [REDACTED] enquired if there was a possibility that the Department might become overly involved in the delivery of bus and coach access. CL and highlighted that [REDACTED] point raised broader questions about the Department's role in the delivery of expansion.

- 6.8. [REDACTED] asked how large the perception was that coaches are not reliable. RJ responded by noting that the quantitative work would find this out, and would be interesting to see. RJ also noted that people who do use coaches find it very reliable. SH added that it is a mode of transport that we don't always think about.

## 7. Domestic Connectivity Update

- 7.1. [REDACTED] started by outlining the commitments made by the Secretary of State before the NPS was designated, giving a mandate for the Aviation Strategy. These were: about fifteen percent of new slots for domestic connectivity, 100 new flights per week from Heathrow to Scotland, and the use of Public Service Obligations (PSOs) on an airport to airport basis (as opposed to the previous use of PSOs for a London to region basis).
- 7.2. [REDACTED] proceeded to take the board through the considerations and challenges to policy implementation, which were slot protection, potential implications on HAL's Business Case, and the impact of discounted domestic fares on international fares.
- 7.3. TP enquired what the Business Case is for this new policy. Sarah Bishop (SB) explained that there are three current PSOs, all of which are subsidised; [REDACTED].
- 7.4. [REDACTED] asked what fifteen percent of new slots for domestic routes would look like. [REDACTED] responded that fifteen percent of the new slots made available under expansion would equate to approximately the same amount of domestic flights that are in operation today. Without the ability to protect existing flights, there is a large degree of uncertainty around the baseline of domestic flights that will be in existence once new capacity is made available.
- 7.5. JG mentioned to the Board that we need to be aware of commitments made in other documents such as the NPS, and bear this in mind for the Aviation Strategy. JG also mentioned that most of the final debate on the NPS was focussed on domestic connectivity, and that Comms on this issue will continue to be vital.
- 7.6. [REDACTED] re-iterated JG's point on the importance of Comms, and highlighted that there is still work to do around the wording that we use. [REDACTED]
- 7.7. [REDACTED]
- 7.8. RM enquired if there was a way to analyse the knock-on effect on international flight charges if domestic flight charges decrease. [REDACTED]

. JG further re-iterated this point.

7.9. CL expressed that she was keen to see domestic connectivity colleagues return to update the Board, [REDACTED]

**Action 180711/4:** ██████ to return to the Board closer to the time of Green Paper publication with an update on domestic connectivity.

7.10. BW asked if we have a register of our domestic connectivity commitments. [REDACTED] assured BW that we do for domestic connectivity. CL noted that it would be a good exercise to go through, ensuring that we are keeping a log and capturing commitments from the NPS and RFD.

**Action 180711/5: [Team TBC] to capture all commitments made by the Secretary of State that are not in the RFD or NPS.**

7.11. [REDACTED] highlighted that when there is a further update on domestic connectivity, there should be more of a discussion on Brexit [REDACTED]

7.12. SB also highlighted that for each workstream, information on Brexit should be available.

**Action 180711/6:** [REDACTED] to work on proposal for pulling information together from different workstreams on Brexit.

## 8. AoB

8.1. CL noted that two sessions might be needed in September for ACPB, and agreed to pick this up offline with [REDACTED].

**Action 180711/7: CL and [REDACTED] to discuss the possibility of multiple sessions for the Board in September.**

8.2. BW asked if there was an August meeting. CL confirmed that there is a Board meeting in August.