

EDINBURGH AIRPORT NOISE ADVISORY BAORD

Minutes of Fourteenth Meeting held on Wednesday 3 October 2018

At the Marriott Hotel, 111 Glasgow Road, Edinburgh

Commencing at 6.30pm

PRESENT: Lindsay Cole (LC) (Chair)

Louise Gunstensen (LG), Dalgety Bay & Hillend CC; Helena Paul (HP, Blackness Area CC / Edinburgh Airport Watch; Christophe Miremont (CM), Ecclesmachan resident; Pippa Plevin (PP), Uphall CC; Merv Archibald (MA) Blackness Area CC; Tom Leatherland (TL), Limekilns and Charleston CC; Ray Godfree (RG), Ratho & District CC; Ray Flint (RF) Kinghorn CC; Adam Cumming (AC), Cramond Association; Andrew Watt (AW), Dalkeith & District CC & Midlothian Federation CC; Liz Scobie (LS), Uphall CC; Vic Garrad (VG); Kirknewton CC; Stefan Slater, Cramond & Barnton CC; Gary Allanach (GA), Winchburgh CC.

In Attendance: Anna Light, Head of Community Engagement, EAL
June McClung, Environmental Noise Advisor, EAL
Louise McIntyre, Community Engagement Manager
Elaine Hill (Minutes)

Apologies: Bruce Finlayson (BF), North Queensferry CC
Gordon Robertson, EAL

		ACTION
1.	Introductions: The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting. He introduced Anna Light, June McClung and Louise McIntyre from Edinburgh Airport and welcomed them to the meeting.	
2.	Approval of Previous Minutes SS proposed and AC seconded that the following minutes be approved: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Minutes (as amended to include BF's comments) of the extraordinary meeting held on 14 August 2018.• Minutes of Meeting No 13 held on 5 September 2018.	
3.	Matters Arising	
3.1	CAA Seminar with EANAB It was noted that at the meeting on 14 August 2018, the CAA agreed to hold a seminar with the Board who now needed to provide a suggested agenda. It was agreed that the CAA should be asked to provide an overview of their community engagement channels.	

<p>3.2</p>	<p>Provision of Complaints Data by EAL</p> <p>It was noted that despite requests since the beginning of the year EAL had still not provided data to the Board in advance of meetings. The Board had asked for information to be provided electronically by 5pm the Friday before each EANAB meeting.</p> <p>J McClung stated that EAL was still waiting for comments back from the Board in relation to the draft report tabled by GR at the last meeting. It was noted that there were not enough copies to go round everyone present at the last meeting and that no electronic version of the document had been provided by EAL.</p> <p>It was agreed that the report should be provided monthly rather than quarterly. It was noted that some months would not be full months depending on when the last day of the month fell in relation to the requirement to provide the reports by 5pm on the Friday before Board meetings.</p> <p>It was also agreed that the report should contain both arrivals and departures and be broken down as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EAL day (0600) and night (2300) • WHO day (0700) and night (2300) • 0600-0700 <p>And contain information from April 2018 onwards.</p> <p>J McClung stated she thought the report code could be written within 2 weeks and would update the Board on timescales.</p>	<p>EAL</p> <p>JMcC</p>
<p>4.</p>	<p>Update from EAL</p> <p>JMcClung gave a presentation on the temporary noise monitor programme which answered 13 questions previously submitted by the Aviation Consultancy Sub-Group. J McClung agreed to circulate a copy of her presentation to the Board.</p> <p>Key points from the presentation were:</p> <p>Q1: <i>What are the location requirements for noise monitors – what areas are suitable or not suitable</i></p> <p>A 2 page document outlining the criteria required for the siting of mobile noise monitors was circulated. J McClung agreed to forward an electronic version so that this could be circulated to potential volunteers. It was also noted that security was a key factor in where the mobile monitors were positioned. Therefore it was unlikely that commercial premises or schools would be suitable.</p>	<p>JMcC</p> <p>JMcC</p>

	<p>Q2: <i>Are monitors switched on all the time or only when a noise event is expected/triggered</i></p> <p>It was noted that the mobile noise monitors were Type 1 – the same as the permanent monitors used by EAL which are located in Cramond, Livingston and Broxburn. The mobile monitors are calibrated yearly off site, self-calibrated daily on site and by J McClung before initial switch on. They are connected into CASPER. They are switched on all the time.</p> <p>Q3: <i>Will the monitors pick up normal speech and other activity in the area? Is this an intrusion into residents' privacy?</i></p> <p>The noise monitors will not pick up personal conversations. The monitors continuously record noise in graph form but there is a set threshold for the playback of sound. J McClung agreed to come back to the Board regarding who sets the threshold for playback and what it is currently set at.</p> <p>Q4: <i>How are the monitors calibrated and what is the tolerance for error</i></p> <p>See Q2 above</p> <p>Q5: <i>How long is each monitor placed in a location? Is this a minimum length of time, or for a minimum number of noise events recorded?</i></p> <p>The mobile monitors are currently sited to record flightpath 06 GOSAM and are in place for 2 weeks. However, if sufficient information hasn't been obtained within this period, they can be returned until J McClung believes she has sufficient data to analyse. The monitors are powered by 2 batteries lasting 2 weeks.</p> <p>Q6: <i>How is weather bias accounted for? Will there be an associated weather report for the period?</i></p> <p>Everything that is recorded is looked at. Background noise is measured at L90</p> <p>Q7: <i>How close should the locations be in relation to the flight track and how is distance from actual flight tracks accounted?</i></p> <p>The more volunteers identified to take a mobile monitor the better. Those closest to the flight paths would be used first. LS agreed to site a mobile monitor on her property and will contact J McClung with contact details.</p> <p>Q8: <i>What data is collected and how will this be shared with the householder and the noise board?</i></p> <p>The Board felt that it was important to capture data relating to where the flight is from, time and length of time of noise. J McClung confirmed that the data is available on the EDI Noise Lab website.</p>	<p>JMcC</p> <p>LS</p>
--	--	-------------------------------------

	<p>Q9a: <i>Will the data be suitable for calculating a background day and night level and corresponding LEQ's as well as SEL's and Lmax for events?</i></p> <p>J McClung confirmed that she would be happy to provide the raw data to a contractor appointed by the Board but not to the Board itself as she did not feel they were qualified to carry out an analysis of the raw data.</p> <p>The analysis report would be based on L90 (background noise), Lmax and LAeq. SEL is recorded but not analysed. The Board felt it was important to analyse SEL data as this provided data regarding the duration of the noise event which lasts longer the further out from the airport communities are. J McClung noted the Board's concerns and agreed to look into this.</p> <p>Q9b: <i>How are householders to be compensated for the inconvenience of having a monitor sited in their home?</i></p> <p>Householders are not compensated. However, EAL does carry out charity work in the communities.</p> <p>Q10: <i>How are locations selected in relation to where noise complaints are emanating?</i></p> <p>As discussed above.</p> <p>Q11: <i>How is the data matched against the flight data? Who does this and when? (ie after data gathered, or are the monitors specifically switched on to capture the noise of specific flights?)</i></p> <p>and</p> <p>Q12: <i>Who/which company is siting the monitors, and who is undertaking the gathering and analysis of the data?</i></p> <p>This work is carried out by J McClung who has a post graduate degree in Acoustics with 14 years' experience of working with Councils, etc., in noise analysis, building acoustics and environmental noise reporting. She confirmed that the information collected could be used to influence future decisions rather than change decisions already made.</p> <p>Thresholds for the mobile monitors are set as per the 3 large London airports but EAL would like to look at these and reduce them for Edinburgh. However, the data needs to be analysed before this can be justified to the airlines.</p> <p>The Board felt that the noise monitors could be under estimating noise levels for arrivals.</p> <p>Previous temporary noise monitors (such as the ones originally sited in Cramond) had an error tolerance of 2.2 compared to the current mobile noise monitors at 0.2.</p> <p>J McClung confirmed that a similar analysis of noise levels would be carried out at the west end of the runway but volunteers were needed to site monitors.</p>	<p>JMcC</p>
--	---	--------------------

	The Chair thanked J McClung, A Light and L McIntyre for attending the meeting. At this point, they left the meeting.	
5.	<p>Board Governance Sub-Group</p> <p>It was agreed that a Board Governance Sub-Group should be set up and would initially look at Terms of Reference, development of the Memorandum of Understanding and its operation, voting guidelines, etc.</p> <p>It was further agreed that the members of this Sub-Group would be AC, RG, BF and LS.</p> <p>With regard to the MoU, it was noted that another lawyer had been identified to advise the Board as the original lawyer was unable to continue due to increased workload.</p>	
6.	<p>Discussion on Establishment of a Health Impact Sub-Group ... and others</p> <p>It was suggested that the Board should look at the effects of disturbed sleep on health. SS suggested that he could look at this initially to get an idea of the size and scope of any potential issues and then decide how much help he would require before setting up a Health Impact Sub-Group. He would particularly focus on night time and depth of sleep.</p> <p>The Board agreed that SS should look at this issue and the Chair agreed to confirm the budget available to allow the purchase of reports, etc., to assist with this research.</p> <p>With regard to other potential Sub-Groups, it was noted that RG had produced and circulated a useful Issues Log which should be used to focus the Board's attention on key issues. For instance, Issue 5 on the list (Night Flights) could be progressed by the Health Impact Sub-Group.</p> <p>With regard to airspace change (Issue 1), a number of issues and errors had been identified. These had been mentioned in the Board's letter regarding the consultation dated 22 June 2018 but no evidence had been presented to back this up. It was felt important that this evidence should be pulled together and submitted to the regulator as soon as possible to show that conflicting data had been used in the consultation. LG and CM agreed to pull this information together in one document as soon as possible.</p>	<p>LC</p> <p>LC/CM</p>
7.	<p>Expanding Aviation Sub-Group</p> <p>It was agreed that the Aviation Sub-Group should be expanded to include AW and RF to include looking at arrivals. It was suggested that this Sub-Group could develop into an Airspace Sub-Group over time making contact with stakeholders such as NATS, ANS, airlines, etc.</p> <p>Once approval received from EAL work would commence on profiles and a Skype meeting would be held with To70 regarding arrivals.</p>	

	<p>It was noted that the need for a Quality of Life Sub-Group had now been overtaken.</p> <p>With regard to Statutory consultees, the Board raised the question of whether noise boards should be included.</p> <p>Following on from the meeting held on 14 August it was agreed to arrange a seminar with CAA for approx. 6 weeks' time – i.e. mid-November to allow time to refine questions.</p> <p>It was suggested that the controlled airspace down the east of the country could be moved to allow commercial flights to fly down the east coast and up the middle of the Forth. It was believed that this had not been discussed between NATS/CAA/Military.</p> <p>It was agreed that HP/AW/RF would circulate a suggested agenda, venue and date. It was agreed that the basis of the seminar should be to look at the current legislative framework, longer terms plans and move forward rather than focus solely on the ACP. It was further agreed that only the CAA and the Board should be present.</p> <p>It was agreed that procedures for communication with external groups be considered by the Governance Sub-Group.</p> <p>It was noted that the Board's letter to the CAA dated 5 September 2018 had still not been made public following the decision at the last meeting not to publish until a response had been received from CAA. A holding response had now been received from Tim Johnson confirming that a full response would not be issued until after the decision had been made on the ACP.</p> <p>Some members of the Board felt that both letters should now be made public and published on the EANAB website. However the Chair raised concerns about the information put forward in the letter by the Board not having been independently validated.</p> <p>Following discussion, it was agreed to upload both letters to the EANAB website with the caveat "awaits independent review".</p>	<p>HP/AW/RF</p> <p>PP</p>
<p>8.</p>	<p>Discussion and Clarification of Board Procedures</p> <p>See Item 5 above.</p>	
<p>9.</p>	<p>Elections</p> <p>The Chair reported that EAL had again offered to provide Secretarial assistance to the Board. However, the Board agreed that, in order to maintain their independence, this should not be provided by EAL. It was agreed that the role of Secretary and the administration of the Board would be looked at by the Governance Sub-Group.</p>	<p>Gov SG</p>

10.	AOB	
10.1	Feedback Forms LG requested that members return these forms to her as soon as possible.	ALL
10.2	Non-Attendance at Meetings It was noted that Owen Griffiths, Bo'ness CC, had not attended meetings for several months. Under the ToR, any members not attending four successive meetings would be removed from the Board. It was agreed that RG would contact Owen Griffiths to advise.	RG
11.	Date of Next Meeting: Wednesday 7 November 2018 at 6.30pm in the Marriott Hotel	

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 9.25pm