

18. [REDACTED] asked if any of this required Government money. [REDACTED] said that the costs shown were all within the Heathrow boundary [REDACTED]. The costs were completely separate from those for Heathrow East. It was noted that the costs were at this stage broad estimates.

ITEM 7: MIXED MODE ConOps

19. [REDACTED] explained that the CAA had now said that they understood how the ConOps could be ICAO-compliant and deliver the full capacity increase desired. [REDACTED] confirmed that CAA agreed in principle, and would be writing shortly to confirm, subject to presentation to them of the final safety case by NATS.

ITEM 8: SURFACE ACCESS

21. This subject was to be covered in more detail at the Surface Access technical meeting on 13 September. BAA said that the mitigation testing programme was on track and should be complete by the end of September.

ITEM 9: MIXED MODE CONSULTATION: PAPER HPB (06) 4

22. David Gray explained that the draft consultation document had been circulated to allow people to offer early comment, - on the overall structure, scope and set of questions rather than on the drafting, which would inevitably undergo substantial change. A discussion ensued about the current draft. [REDACTED] suggested it was overly descriptive with insufficient emphasis on costs versus benefits, though it was pointed out that in this first draft the explanatory material was more developed than the analytical. Jonathan Sharrock asked whether thought had gone into providing a more accessible

version of the document, [REDACTED] David Gray said that the aim was to provide an accessible document, and some work had begun on a brief tick-box questionnaire to aid responses. He also emphasised that there was already a flag in the document to outline the benefits in more detail. [REDACTED] suggested that the document should be carefully targeted to the audience and different versions may be required. [REDACTED] queried the wisdom of inviting views on the surface access options if they were found to be essential to delivery. It was agreed that this would depend on whether we ended up with genuine alternative packages. [REDACTED] [REDACTED]. Jonathan Sharrock stressed the need to keep lawyers fully engaged in the process.

ITEM 10: DELIVERY PROJECT: PAPER HPB (06) 05

23. Michael Jackson asked for clarification that the governance of the Delivery Project would be through the Project Board, rather than any other forum. He also posed the question as to whether the composition of the Project Board should change as we moved from environmental considerations towards a more delivery-focussed agenda. Martin Capstick said that he was reluctant to see the group significantly changed and agreed that the Delivery Project should continue to report through this group.

24. [REDACTED] suggested that it would be useful to have a detailed workplan for the delivery project, as we have for the evaluation strand. He said that it would be useful to consider what 'Delivery' questions should be covered in consultation.

25. Jonathan Moor suggested that the Project Board should not place too much emphasis on what is beyond consultation; rather it should focus on those Delivery issues that we need to know about to inform the consultation, such as Buncfield and Heathrow East. He acknowledged the importance of the High Level Plan (circulated by Michael Jackson), which the Delivery team would populate further with BAA's assistance.

ITEM 11: AOB - none.

26. The next Project Board meeting would take place on 17 October at 1430.

that, /

15. [REDACTED] noted that the HA was an emanation of the DfT. He felt the BAA paper did not exhaust the potential options, including for addressing operational concerns on the M4. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] He said that, if BAA were to provide a 'nil detriment' solution, HA would not object, but it would be important to address any residual congestion problems too.

16. Martin Capstick said that, for the purposes of consultation, the key issue was to have a plausible package that brought the area around Heathrow within EU AQ limits. He said that BAA would not be required to deliver these alone, but needed to assemble partners that together could provide assurance that it would happen. He noted that, if anything, the Mayor's opposition to expansion appeared to be strengthening.

Action: BAA

10. [REDACTED] asked if the BAA paper could be circulated more widely within HMT. It was agreed that this would not pose a problem, provided it was made clear that it was a draft document.

ITEM 6: PROJECT PLANS

(i) Latest DfT High Level Project Plan

19. Martin Capstick said that this was a diagrammatic representation of the timeline set out by Michael Jackson in his paper, discussed under item 3. [REDACTED] said that it was important to look closely at the resource implications of this timetable. NATS had expressed concern about this in the earlier meeting on R3, where it was noted that there would be 3 major consultations taking place next summer on: Heathrow, Stansted and Airspace Change. Michael Jackson said that resource issues in the context of the

CAA. This should ensure that the planning process would be a relatively straightforward 18 month period.

19. Michael Jackson said that clarity was needed as to whether phase 1 of the MM ConOps constituted airspace change even if there was no change to SIDs. He also said that, rather than have multiple airspace change processes, it would be most sensible to have one consultation that focussed on the end game, even if the change was implemented in stages. [REDACTED] agreed. David Gray commented that this issue was also being pursued internally within DfT.

20. David Gray asked whether there had been engagement with the CAA similarly on the R3 study. [REDACTED] said that nothing had been set up yet.

ITEM 8: CONSULTATION DOCUMENT (DfT Paper HPB (06) 12)

21. David Gray presented the outline consultation document and said that he welcomed comments, particularly if people judged anything crucial to be missing. [REDACTED] said that BAA would feed through comments in due course.

22. [REDACTED] said that there was some concern amongst local residents about the joint consultation. They thought that it may be used to play one party off against another, such as by asking whether they would prefer R3 or MM. Although the draft *Questions* did not suggest that was a problem, he thought it would be important to keep reference to R3 and MM distinctly separate in the condoc to avoid this criticism.

23. Michael Jackson said that it was important for people to comment early on the condoc so that we could build it up quickly as we received results. David Gray said DfT would approach key parties for input, as necessary. [REDACTED] said that a much of the content of the Government consultation could probably be re-used in the airspace change consultation and the CAA would be happy to advise on this.

24. Paul Harwood said that paragraph 5 of the outline document should refer to the 'spatial planning process' rather than 'land use planning process' to reflect necessary integration with other processes, such as the London Plan. He also said that many of the mitigation measures would have wide-ranging implications and it may be necessary to have a full annex on these. David Gray agreed.

ITEM 9: AOB

25. There was no other business. The next meeting will be on 17 January at 2.30pm.

[REDACTED]

15.

Action: DfT

17. Michael Jackson mentioned that technological developments, such as curved approaches, might also come into play in the MM timescale. Jonathan Moor said that potential new technologies should be touched on in the consultation.

ITEM 7: PROGRAMME FOR CONSULTATION (DfT Paper HPB (06) 13)

18. Michael Jackson said that [REDACTED] had been identified as the earliest date for consultation launch. This paper set out the blocks of work leading up to the launch of consultation and beyond. He asked all to consider whether there were any omissions. [REDACTED] said that it was important to have a project plan that clearly showed how the environmental assessment work linked into the consultation stage. Dean Dyer said a draft of such a plan had been created and would be provided in due course.

Action: All
Action: DfT

19. Jonathan Moor said that he thought [REDACTED] would have to be in [REDACTED] allowing for exhibitions [REDACTED]

20. Jonathan Moor said the submission needed to make clear when SofS needed to make a decision, in order for a certain launch date to be possible. He also said that it would be important to get a balanced view in the consultation, ie. not just focussing attention on those under the flight path, but also consulting London businesses and pro-expansion groups.

21. Jonathan Sharrock asked how the exhibitions would be handled in Harlington: [REDACTED] explained that a BAA comms team was working closely with DfT, going out to different associations and asking what their major concerns were, to ensure that the exhibitions

5. There was a discussion about the wording of risk 2.1.3 (strength of opposition from residents derails project). [redacted] suggested that the actions identified in the risk register were not adequately addressing the risk. It was agreed that Vicki Mayo should revisit the wording as it related to our strategy for engaging with stakeholders - part of the wider communications strategy. Natalie Wirth also agreed to circulate a note on residual high risks 1.2.1 and 2.1.3, which had been submitted for the Programme Board.

Actions: DfT

ITEM 4: MODELLING RESULTS AND NEXT STEPS

6. David Gray outlined the content of paper HPR (07) 014

7. David Gray mentioned the recent technical problem with the surface access model, which had led to delays (see para 3), but said that good progress had been made elsewhere to resolve loose ends with the AQ modelling, and CERC were standing ready to run forward scenarios as soon as road traffic inputs were received. [redacted] said that a necessary input would be the work in hand by CERC to establish how much NO_x needed to be removed to achieve a compliant solution

8. [redacted] said he believed it necessary to hold a 'practice run' of the forecasting workshop using the data currently available. This would enable key players to rehearse the process. [redacted]

Jonathan Moor said that he could see no harm in an early workshop if it allowed those involved to be better placed to take decisions when the data came available.

Action: BAA/DfT

9. In discussion, Jonathan Moor suggested that it would be good discipline to draw up a project plan aimed at a [redacted] launch date. [redacted] said that BAA supported this proposal. Michael Jackson pointed out that the four week contingency in the previous project plan [redacted] was now gone and this plan had not taken account of any reforecasting. He suggested that [redacted] may be possible, but no earlier. Jonathan Moor said that the latest date

David Gray

said that it was the intention for all modelling work to be completed

15. [REDACTED] said that they had had initial discussions with NATS on the R3 study and expected to see the documentation imminently. Once they received this they would analyse it and report back. He would be better placed to give an assessment of how long this would take once they received the document.

16. [REDACTED] said that CAA's initial observation was that the study focussed heavily on the immediate environs of Heathrow and that it would be important to look at airspace consequences outside this area. He said that airspace was finite and, as Jonathan Moor acknowledged, [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] Jonathan Moor mentioned that he was meeting with [REDACTED] immediately after the Project Board. [REDACTED] suggested that the consultation document would need a section on airspace consequences.

ITEM 7: PROJECT PLAN

17. This was discussed under item 4 (para 9).

ITEM 8: PAPERS FOR INFORMATION

- (i) Programme Board Paper: Heathrow Air Quality - Model Runs (Paper HPB (07) 03)
- (ii) Consultation Communications Strategy - Summary (Paper HPB (07) 04)

18. Jonathan Moor said that the comms strategy should be a substantive item at the next meeting. Vicki Mayo said that she would be attending residents' association meetings next week to talk to them about the consultation process.

Action: DfT

ITEM 9: AOB

19. There was no AOB.

ITEM 10: Date of next meeting

The next meeting will be on 12 March at the later time of 1530.

29..

could be properly targeted. He suggested that there would be benefit in consulting stakeholders about what they expected from the consultation process. To this end, it was agreed that a representative from the PSDH comms team would attend the Heathrow Focus Forum on 20 March.

Action: DFT

22. Susan Hamilton said that the NATS consultation on airspace redesign for Terminal Control North (airspace around Stansted) [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] said that the TC SW consultation would also be around the same time.

ITEM 8: AOB

23. There was no AOB.

ITEM 9: Date of next meeting

24. It was agreed to rearrange the next meeting to avoid half term week. [The revised date for the next meeting is 20 February.]

AED3 January 2007

30.

March 07

[REDACTED]

Action: DfT

5. On the issue of MM Within Existing Limits, [REDACTED] said that BAA were thinking about what could be done without necessitating an airspace change process. They would arrange a meeting with CAA to discuss this.

Action: BAA

ITEM 3: RISKS

6. Natalie Wirth said that risk 1.2.1 (mitigation measures) remained High. It would not be possible to reduce this until we received further model outputs. Jonathan Moor asked if there were any further solutions to the issue of mitigation.

1.3.4 and 1.3.5 (delays to roads modelling/technical problem) were also residual High, but could now be reduced to Medium in light of the discussion in paragraph 3 above. 1.3.6 (strategy on exceedences on the Strategic Road Network) was also residual High (see para 4 above). Natalie Wirth said that the wording of 2.1.3 (residents' opposition to expansion) had been amended and a fuller description provided of the measures in place to manage the risk. This would also be discussed further under agenda item 6(i).

7.

Action: BAA
Action: DfT

ITEM 4: BAA/DfT REFORECASTING WORKSHOP

8. David Gray gave an update of the workshop on 8 March, which he said had been productive. He said that we were now fairly confident that the 'sighting shots' gave a reliable picture of airport-related emissions.

9.