

Edinburgh Airport Noise Advisory Board

Minutes of Eighth Meeting held on Wednesday 6 April 2018
at the Marriott Hotel, 111 Glasgow Road, Edinburgh
Commencing at 6.30pm

Present: Lindsey Cole (LC) (Chair)

Helena Paul (HP), Blackness Area CC / Edinburgh Airport Watch (Minutes), Ray Godfree (RF), Ratho District CC, Bruce Finlayson (BF), North Queensferry, Bob Brough (BB), Cramond CC, Adam Cumming (AC), Cramond Association, Andrew Watt (AW), Dalkeith and district CC and Midlothian Federation CC, Christophe Miremont (CM), Ecclesmachan resident, Pippa Plevin (PP), Uphall CC, Liz Scobie (LS), Uphall CC, Merv Archibald (MA), Blackness Area CC, Tom Leatherland (TL), Limekilns and Charleston CC, Ray Flint (RF), Kinghorn CC, Gary Allanach (GAL), Winchburgh CC

Joining by telephone:

Louise Gunstenson (LG), Dalgety Bay CC

In attendance: Gordon Robertson (GR), EAL

Apologies: Vic Garrad (VG) Kirknewton CC

| | |
|-----------|---|
| 1. | <p>Introductions:</p> <p>The Chair introduced Gordon Robertson attending from EAL.</p> |
| 2. | <p>Approval of previous minutes:</p> <p>Approval of the minutes of the meeting held on 7th March was proposed by TL and seconded by LS.</p> |
| 3. | <p>Matters Arising from the Previous Minutes</p> <p>None not already on the agenda</p> |
| 4. | <p>EAL update from Gordon Robertson</p> <p>GR updated the meeting on various matters: Progress of Airspace Change Application (ACP), Noise Action Plan (NAP), The new Noise and Track-keeping System (NTS)</p> <p>1. ACP:</p> <p>The CAA has “paused” their review of the EAL ACP made last summer. EAL has been in discussions with the CAA to resolve the areas that caused the CAA to pause its application review, and is in negotiation with the CAA regarding requirements and timings for the review process to begin again. This is dependent on CAA resources. Once the timetable is known, then EAL would call for an Extraordinary meeting of the EANAB to discuss.</p> <p>There were 3 issues in the ACP that the CAA had concerns with:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed early turn off runway 06 to reduce noise over Cramond. 2. NATS en route co-ordination with Prestwick Air Traffic Control. |

3. Spacing and separation issues with aircraft over the Forth.

Early turn to avoid Cramond:

The 15 degree left turn was not acceptable due to a conflict with the Designated End of Runway. In the latest design, a waypoint has been introduced at the end of the runway. GR could not confirm how sharp the turn would now be.

In the course of GR's explanation, it became clear that EAL had not altered the rest of the application from the original iteration. This news was greeted with general dismay from members. Particular concerns were raised about the impact of increased departures over West Lothian, Fife, and Falkirk districts, and of Arrivals over Midlothian, and the feeling was that concerns raised by Communities had not been properly addressed.

GR responded stating that concerns had been addressed and that the proposals represented the best balance of the options presented. EAL has to move to RNAV and build more capacity. Timescales are subject to CAA approval, with expected implementation now early 2019.

Members disagreed that issues raised by Communities had been properly addressed, or that a move to RNAV of itself requires new flight paths, or that EAL has actually properly demonstrated that it requires additional capacity as the airport is clearly operating well below its declared runway capacity now and will still be operating under capacity by 2024 using the airport's own projections.

Specific questions raised **and GR responded to each in turn.**

1. How have the issues raised by communities been addressed?
2. Communities not previously overflowed who now are, even before the ACP is decided, remain very unhappy about the degree of new and unwanted noise disturbance. How has this matter been addressed?
3. The consultation process and material was fundamentally flawed for multiple reasons, it is not only right and proper that communities are consulted again?
4. Population data published was wrong, so responders based their submissions on faulty data.
5. The ACP differs substantially from the preferred routes consulted on and the impact on some communities will be far worse than was indicated in the consultation material – eg Route E has changed significantly between the consultation and the application with a different route (E7 instead of the preferred E6), and 111 planes per day rather than the 41 per day consulted on. EAL can chose to re-consult with affected Communities when there are significant changes between consultation and application, why are there no plans to do so?
6. Concerns expressed about night flights. Why has EAL decided that daytime starts at 0600, when WHO rules state "day" begins at 0700?
7. Doubts were expressed that if implemented the airport would indeed stick to the agreed operational times for flights and the projected numbers on the different routes, particularly as there appeared to be no effective "policing" of flight path usage or vectoring.

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>8. Concerns about the claims that the airport requires additional capacity, and that this cannot be found in other ways without requiring radical airspace change with severe impacts on multiple communities.</p> <p>Following discussion on the various points raised, GR summarised:</p> <p>we have already consulted and have no plans to consult again, we will do what we think is best. The CAA will measure the airport on what we do versus what we said we would do.</p> <p>agreed to provide a full explanation to the Board to demonstrate precisely with data why EAL believes the additional capacity is required.</p> |
| | <p>ACTION: GR to provide capacity explanation to the NAB GR to correspond with Cramond directly, and will talk to Midlothian reps about specific issues there.</p> |
| | <p>2. Noise Action Plan</p> <p>It was noted that since the previous meeting, the Board had sent two letters to the Chair and CEO of EAL. The Board's request for a meeting with the full EANAB remains outstanding. The key item on the agenda would be to agree a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between EAL and the Board. When would this meeting take place?</p> <p>GR reported that Sir John Elvidge (EAL Chair) and Gordon Dewar (CEO) were keen to meet with the Board and were looking at dates for a meeting. They had asked GR to attend EANAB meetings, and to assist in the creation of the MoU documents.</p> <p>It was noted that BF had already circulated via email a document that could provide a good starting point.</p> <p>It was agreed that: all members would provide BF with their input for the MoU and that BF would co-ordinate responses and circulate a draft document. BF and GR would then meet to discuss the draft MoU.</p> <p>As the NAP consultation ended on 2nd April, the EANAB has still to submit comments. Will EAL accept a late submission?</p> <p>It was pointed out that there had been more than a fortnight's delay in the receipt of paper copies of the documentation, further shortening an already brief 6 week consultation period. EAL could have distributed copies of the consultation documents to the Board at the March meeting, but had not done so.</p> <p>Many Councils and Community Councils would have difficulty managing a 6 week consultation process within their usual meetings cycle.</p> <p>Members also advised that the previous NAP detailed in the document was different from the NAP available via the EAL website.</p> <p>GR suggested that section 10 of the draft NAP is the key part for comment and that some relevant areas are Night Flights, noise maps that do not tell the full story about how areas are impacted by noise, whether it should be a dynamic document that evolves over time.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>GR was asked how many responses have been received to the consultation and how many people attended the drop in. He replied that EAL would publish a report in due course and at the moment he did not know the numbers, and attendance had been “good” at the three drop ins. This was disputed by members who had been at drop ins which were poorly attended by members of the public.</p> <p>Several members reported problems with their online submissions of responses to the NAP, and noted that there had not been any electronic acknowledgement of their submission. Does this mean that their response has not been captured? GR said he would look into this as acknowledgements should have been sent automatically.</p> <p>It was agreed that EAL would accept submissions that came in “a little bit late”. Members agreed to form a joint response. CM would co-ordinate responses from members, which would be submitted to EAL. The substantive comments would be discussed at the May meeting. EAL will submit its NAP to the Scottish Government by the end of April.</p> |
| | <p>ACTION:</p> <p>MoU: All EANAB members to send their comments for inclusion in the MoU to BF by Wednesday 11th April. BF will work on creating a draft document for members to comment on, and would then arrange to meet with GR to discuss the draft.</p> <p>NAP: All members to submit comments to CM by 13th April for onward transmission to EAL for inclusion in the consultation process.</p> <p>GR to provide dates for a meeting with the Chair and CEO of EAL</p> |
| | <p>3. The new Noise and Track-keeping System (NTS)</p> <p>GR advised that the noise monitors would be replaced with new ones in the same locations this week. System testing begins next week. New Casper system expected to go live to the public at the beginning of May. EAL intends to ask the EANAB for input on the new system, which will have additional capability for members of the public to review flights. 5 years of historical radar data from the previous Harris system has been uploaded, and reports and visualisations of flights can be created using that data via Casper. The new Casper system will allow greater “granularity” and flexibility in how data and information is presented.</p> <p>Concerns were raised that Caspar relies on Adobe Flash which is not supported by commonly used browsers due to security concerns with the software. Adobe ending its support for Flash in 2020. GR said that EAL would look into this.</p> <p>Other matters discussed: Complaints Data Members requested noise complaints data – it was noted that this had been requested at previous meetings. Sight of the historical noise complaint data would assist in</p> |

| | |
|----|---|
| | <p>understanding the current issues with noise in Communities and how these have arisen. We require at least the last 5 years of complaints data.</p> <p>Availability of historic flight radar data: GR confirmed full flight data is available for the last 5 years of EAL operations.</p> |
| | <p>ACTION: GR to provide 5 years of noise complaints data. GR to report back to the EANAB on the reasons why Adobe Flash is being used.</p> |
| 5. | <p>Legal Entity Status for the EANAB</p> <p>It was again raised that the current arrangements for the Board's legal status are unsatisfactory, as members currently are personally and severally liable for any Board decisions. As volunteers, this is an unacceptable burden, and a solution must be found without further delay. It was accepted that the Board's independence is paramount, but that members cannot be reasonably expected to bear personal liability in execution of the Board's responsibilities.</p> <p>Possible options may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an unincorporated organisation with a constitution, • a company limited by guarantee with a memorandum and articles of association, • an indemnity being provided by EAL to members of the Board. <p>It was noted that the Board had previously discussed the possibility of seeking independent legal advice paid for by EAL to resolve this matter. A draft constitution has already been worked on by the Board.</p> <p>The Board is an entity independent of EAL, issues may arise due to the Board appointing contractors to carry out work, while it is expected that EAL would fund such work, contractual responsibilities and thus liabilities may be shared with the Board who would have sign off on any contractual activities it may instruct.</p> <p>GR undertook to investigate further and would contact Gatwick and Heathrow to find out more about their Noise Board structures. He would also talk to EAL's inhouse legal team.</p> <p>It was agreed that this point should be covered in the MoU, and the matter should be continued on the agenda for future meetings.</p> |
| | <p>ACTION: GR to report back to EANAB on his discussions regarding legal entity status for the Board. GR and BF to include the status of the Board in the MoU Legal Entity Status to remain on EANAB agenda until appropriately resolved</p> |
| 6. | <p>Sub-group: Aviation consultancy - progress update.</p> <p>The sub group has circulated 3 papers: a progress update and recommendations, a sample data request for EAL and a brief for the consultancy, To70.</p> <p>Recommendation is that To70 is appointed to analyse flight data, the data to be provided by EAL and cost for this initial project to be funded by EAL.</p> |

| | |
|----|--|
| | <p>Initial project will be to ask the consultancy to analyse the historic flight data since 2011 to assess what has changed in the way the airspace is being used in a defined area around the airport.</p> <p>Some discussion around the papers, that included the point that the flight data obtained from EAL should contain the destination and origin as well as the type of aircraft and that the analysis should cover both arrivals and departures. It may also be interesting to look at the scheduled arrival and departure times, versus the actual.</p> <p>In the circumstances, a single tender with To70 is justified and multiple quotes will not be required. While EAL may have security concerns relating to the release of the historical flight data to the EANAB, it is clear what the purpose of the data request is, and the data is already in the public domain. It was also noted that the EANAB Code of Conduct covers confidentiality.</p> <p>Noted that the EANAB is very keen to make progress on this project quickly, and it seems a sensible starting point.</p> <p>Agreed to forward the three papers to GR in the expectation of an early response.</p> |
| | ACTION: TL to send sub group papers to GR. GR to consider and report back to EANAB ASAP. |
| 7. | <p>University of Edinburgh update.</p> <p>AC advised that he has been in contact with 2 academics at the University of Edinburgh, School of Engineering. An acoustics and audio specialist, and a mathematician and statistician. AC intends to meet with them to establish what they may be able to do to assist the Board.</p> |
| | ACTION: AC to meet with Edinburgh University and report back to the Board |
| 8. | <p>Website</p> <p>The Board expressed their regret at the news that Gordon Allen has decided to resign from the EANAB. In his absence, he was warmly thanked for the work he has done to date on the Board Logo and Website. GA has offered to continue to support the Board in managing the email contact list.</p> <p>Some discussion of the Board's website. It was agreed that the Board needs a method of communicating with the outside world, and that any web content would be "owned" by the Board. In particular agendas and minutes of meetings would be published.</p> <p>The issue is web hosting, and who should manage that process. GR offered to assist – possibly by hosting the EANAB website via EAL, but with the Board having full control over the content of the site. It is unclear whether GA has already purchased a domain name.</p> <p>Discussion of a Facebook page for info dissemination only and therefore closed to comments: GAL advised such a page could be public, closed or "secret". GAL to continue to look into a Facebook presence for the Board.</p> |
| | ACTION: GR to investigate web hosting for the EANAB, PP to manage the gmail account in future, RG to continue to update the list of members. GAL to continue to investigate using Facebook. |
| 9. | AOCB |
| | <p>9.1: EACC Edinburgh Airport Consultative Committee</p> <p>It was again raised that the EANAB expected a report from the Chair ahead of the next EACC meeting detailing his presentation to the EACC on behalf of the EANAB.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>LC advised he had intended to make his report verbally, however it was pointed out that he has already agreed to provide a written report to the EANAB ahead of the EACC meeting. It was noted that at the EACC meeting in November, the minutes reflect that LC had commented that <i>“LC felt that noise complaints were well handled by EAL”</i>. It was noted that the EANAB had not had the opportunity to discuss noise complaints, and that any future comments from the Chair of the EANAB must reflect the agreed position of the Board.</p> |
| | <p>ACTION: LC agreed to provide a report of his presentation to the EANAB at the next EANAB meeting in May ahead of the next EACC meeting on 14th May 2018.</p> |
| | <p>Further discussion on the EACC, with dissatisfaction again being expressed by members that the EANAB “reports” to the EACC. There are two distinct problems with this: 1. The approach of the EACC which does not seem to fully appreciate the issues being created within Communities by EAL’s operations, and 2. The quarterly meetings cycle of the EACC does not match the monthly meetings cycle of the EANAB. GR informed members that the EANAB does not report to the EACC as such. He agreed that noise was not being properly addressed at the EACC. EANAB should report to and engage with EAL directly.</p> <p>GR asked who else we would wish to invite to EANAB meetings. It was noted that the EANAB needed to engage with the individuals within both EAL and ATC operations who had responsibility for matters that created the noise and who could therefore do something about it. GR mentioned the Airline Operations Committee (AOC). This is currently being chaired by the Base Captain of Ryannair. It may be appropriate to invite him to the EANAB meetings, as noise is not currently on the AOC agenda.</p> |
| | <p>ACTION: EANAB to invite operations staff to future meetings as appropriate.</p> |
| | <p>DATE OF NEXT MEETING: Wednesday 2nd May at 6.30pm in the Marriott Hotel</p> |

There being no further business the meeting closed at 8.40 pm.