

**EDINBURGH AIRPORT NOISE ADVISORY BOARD**

**Minutes of Twenty Eighth Meeting held on Tuesday 3<sup>rd</sup> December 2019**

**At the Marriott Hotel, 111 Glasgow Road, Edinburgh**

**Commencing at 6.30pm**

**Present:**

Lindsay Cole, (LC); Merv Archibald, (MA), Blackness Area CC; Adam Cumming (AC); Cramond Association; John Duffy (JD), Broxburn CC; Bruce Finlayson (BF), North Queensferry CC; Ray Flint, (RF) Kinghorn CC; Ray Godfree (RG), Ratho & District CC; Louise Gunstensen (LG), Dalgety Bay & Hillend CC; Tom Leatherland (TL), Limekilns and Charleston CC; Neil Lovett (NL), East Calder CC; Christophe Miremont (CM), Ecclesmachan resident; Helena Paul (HP), Blackness Area CC / Edinburgh Airport Watch; Pippa Plevin (PP), Uphall CC; Liz Scobie (LS), Uphall CC; Andrew Watt (AW), Dalkeith & District CC & Midlothian Federation CC; Tom Wylie (TM) Cramond and Barnton CC

**In Attendance:** Gordon Robertson (GR) EAL: Anna Light (AL) EAL  
Vita ?? (V??) EAL

**Apologies:** Vic Garrard (VG), Kirknewton CC

ITEM		ACTION
1.	<p><b>Approval of previous minutes:</b></p> <p>Due to the withdrawal of service by the minute secretary, preparation of the minutes of the previous meeting on 6<sup>th</sup> November had been disrupted. Minutes had been circulated amongst Members and EAL for comment and input, and issued for final comment on 2<sup>nd</sup> December 2019. There being no further comments these minutes were approved, for circulation: proposed by AC and seconded by TL.</p>	
2	<p><b>Matters Arising from previous meetings</b></p> <p><b>Noise &amp; Proposed Residential Developments</b></p> <p><b>2.1</b> <i>21.3.16 It was agreed that to draw up a list of bullet points on the different routes the Board could take to become a consultee on planning applications where residential developments could be affected by aircraft noise. It was proposed that educational, residential and leisure groups within a defined radius of the 51Leq noise contour map be contacted with a view to canvassing opinion as to how the Board might collate comments on proposed planning applications</i></p> <p><b>2.2</b> <i>21.4.2 Notes of the Noise Monitoring meeting on 16 April had been circulated to the Board. It was noted that the Board had concerns about how the meeting went. The Chair stressed that a further meeting should be arranged as soon as possible and a list of issues to be discussed would be issued to EAL. It was noted that the</i></p>	<p><b>ONGOING LG</b></p>

	<p><i>informal notes taken by the sub-group would also be circulated to EAL.</i></p> <p><i>A report from the further meeting held on 6<sup>th</sup> August to be circulated in due course.</i></p> <p><i>Awaiting final comments for the report.</i></p> <p><b>It was confirmed the report is being prepared</b></p>	<p><b>Ongoing EAL</b></p>
<p><b>2.3</b></p>	<p><b>21.4.4</b> <i>EAL agreed to involve the Aviation Consultancy Sub-Group in discussions with ERDC relating to noise modelling. It was noted that no further progress had been made and that any response received from ERDC would be shared with the sub-group.</i></p> <p><i>EAL confirmed that they had escalated this matter as still no progress had been made due to absence of Darren Rhodes. Another prompt will be made next week EANAB will continue to invite dialogue with the groups.</i></p> <p><i>This crucial piece of work has been commissioned by EAL but no progress has been made. EAL worked with the sub-group to agree the criteria for the noise modelling, which EAL then commissioned ERCD to carry out; that work is currently ongoing. EANAB are also seeking to speak directly with ERCD but as yet have had no response.</i></p>	<p><b>Ongoing EAL</b></p>
<p><b>2.4</b></p>	<p><b>22.6.1 EACC CEO report</b></p> <p><i>EAL agreed to check if the EACC CEO report could be made available to EANAB and/or if it was available on the EAL website. It was noted that the EACC CEO report is issued in confidence to the Chair of EANAB who sits on the EACC. It was agreed that the Chair and AC would speak to Robert Carr to discuss the possibility of circulating the report to EANAB members. It was further noted that the report does not appear on the EACC website.</i></p> <p><i>The Report is to include an agreed EANAB position, with a brief before and after the meeting as EANAB are represented. LC to make the strategy and the CEO Report available. PP to place it on Google Drive. Next meeting is 11/11/19 at 10 am.</i></p> <p><i>All reports are available on publication but a copy will be sent to LC in time for review before the November meeting. The full report is requested and responses. Awaiting the outcome of discussion at the 11<sup>th</sup> November EACC meeting</i></p>	<p><b>LC/AC/PP Ongoing</b></p>
<p><b>2.5</b></p>	<p><b>Updates from Sub-Groups:</b></p> <p><b>25.4.2</b> <i>Aviation Sub sub Group Report</i></p> <p><i>A presentation was made by AW and RF demonstrating current flight paths and feasible alterations that could be made to avoid densely populated areas. This presentation is still a work in progress but will be circulated upon completion.</i></p> <p><i>Can EANAB take these suggestions to ANS?</i></p> <p><i>A set of principals are to be drawn up within the next month as most flights could be cut by fifteen minutes saving fuel and disruption.</i></p>	

2.6	<p><i>There is a gap between the MoD restricted areas which is not published. They are to be approached regarding this.</i></p> <p><i>RF tabled his key design principals for discussion at the October meeting.</i></p>	Ongoing AW/RF
2.7	<p><b>25.4.5 Health</b></p> <p><i>As soon as an appointment has been confirmed it will be announced.</i></p> <p><i>LG to draft a letter to MSPs. Pending meeting arranged for 3<sup>rd</sup> October. <b>Considered closed ??</b></i></p>	Ongoing LG/LC
2.8	<p><b>ACP Up-date</b></p> <p><b>25.5.1 MA's Questions:</b></p> <p><i>Q3: No, There is no raw data in case of misinterpretation but not in this instance. The data is in the public domain and is specific and factual. JMcC to email AL as this information request was agreed in the Statement of Need.</i></p> <p><i>JMcC advised that emailing AL and GR would be the most effective way to progress this.</i></p> <p><i>Q5.: Email AL/GR</i></p> <p><i>The Questions and Answers can be shared via the website.</i></p> <p><i>EAL analysts are compiling the data. A firm date for the answers was requested as it is crucial information and essential to EANAB.</i></p> <p><i>LMcI requested that Minutes be issued to EAL sooner to allow time for response. <b>Minutes are issued as soon as available</b></i></p>	JMcC/RG Ongoing
2.9	<p><b>Up Dates from Sub Groups</b></p> <p><u>Aviation (sub-sub) Group Report.</u></p> <p><b>26.3.2.1</b> A master list of principals is to be compiled. EAL were asked for reports of flight going East and of their awareness of the time constraints for this report. It was noted that some workshop attendees felt this stage of the ACP process be restarted for consistency. The new name of the group is to be: Outer Airways Group.</p> <p>LMcI is to reply to a request for the feedback in good time for the January deadline.</p> <p>There is serious concern of inconsistency in the information and the integrity of the process.</p>	LMcI <b>CLOSED</b>
2.10	<p><b>Statement of Need</b></p> <p>Noted that in the Statement of Need the altitude range from 7,000 to 20,000ft was not included in the tick box so it would appear that the ACP will not consider potential use of the Forth estuary for new flight paths. In addition the Statement of Need excluded any reference to evidence supporting the premise that there was a lack of runway capacity, and similarly there was no evidence supporting the stated economic benefit of EDI to the Scottish economy.</p>	LC

2.11	<p><b>26.4.1</b> These queries, particularly the 7,000ft limit on altitude, need addressing to progress the process. LC to include these concerns in his letter to GR. Parallel timelines are necessary.</p>	
	<p><b>ACP - Consultation Method</b>  <b>26.5</b> Concerns were expressed on the method of consultation and the width of its sphere. It is not a true consultation in terms of CAP 1616. The lack of discussion in the workshops was highlighted and queries raised about the re-invitation selection process as weaknesses will be created if they are cherry picked. LC asked to attend another workshop but LMcl was unsure if this was possible. Concerns over delays in information share were stated.</p>	LMcl
2.12	<p>A list of people invited was requested. <b>This probably closed out but LMcl Comment needs to be taken on board so EANAB can pursue the action</b></p>	LMcl
2.13	<p><b>26.6.2</b> Flight Radar 24: A member of EANAB was unsure of some freight carrier names. To save them time finding out the information, LMcl offered to do this and send a list of names and their codes to the member.</p>	LMcl ONGOING ALL
2.14	<p><b>26.6.3</b> A list of the needs of the Communities should be compiled in good time for the November meeting. Noted that members who had responded should do so as soon as possible</p>	LC
2.15	<p><b>26.6.4</b> Rob Light of ICAN will be invited to a meeting or skyped in. <b>A meeting is arranged for the coming week.</b></p>	
2.16	<p><b>Aviation</b>  <b>27.3.1.1</b> The design principle stage is underway. Board members are circulating their design principles which need to be concluded. Members' comments to be sent to BF.  Assistance is required to help compile the final report.</p>	AC/BF
	<p>An implementation letter has been drafted and is to be concluded.</p>	
2.17	<p><b>Presentation on Aircraft Movements</b>  <b>27.3.2.1</b>  A presentation was provided by an EANAB member on the case for expansion at Edinburgh Airport.  The Chair asked that the presentation be circulated.</p>	CM OA Group
2.18	<p><b>OUTER AIRWAYS REPORT (formerly Aviation (Sub-Sub) Group Report )</b>  <b>27.3.3.1</b> Members of EANAB are attempting to contact AMS</p>	RG/PP
2.19	<p><b>MOU</b>  It was confirmed that a signed copy of the MOU has been received and is to be uploaded to the EANAB website</p>	RG

<p>2.20</p> <p>2.21</p> <p>2.22</p>	<p><b>REVIEW OF ISSUES LOG</b></p> <p><b>27.3.6.1</b> It was noted that the <b>OUTER AIRWAYS GROUP</b> should be added to the Log</p> <p><b>Statement of Need</b></p> <p><b>27.4.1</b> It was questioned whether the SoN was passed (by CAA) as Anna had corrected Sarah in a meeting stating that it had not.</p> <p><b>Governance of EANAB</b></p> <p><b>27.6</b> A discussion will take place on how to report and lead discussion. The Governance Sub Group will then be brought in.</p> <p><b>AOB</b></p> <p>A standing invitation has been extended to AL and GD. It was noted that GR had texted during the meeting to advise that a separate ACP update meeting would be arranged before the scheduled December meeting. It was suggested that a core ACP group be formed if necessary and it was agreed that an ad hoc meeting be called with GD in late November or early December to discuss ACP.</p>	<p>??</p> <p>LC/RG</p> <p>LC</p>
<p>3</p> <p>3.1</p>	<p><b>PRESENTATIONS BY EAL</b></p> <p><b>Growth and Airspace Capacity by Gordon Robertson</b></p> <p>It was noted that the presentation would be addressing capacity going back to the Statement of Need put in at Stage 1A. The intention is to try to explain the drivers behind capacity rather than talking about noise, communities, environment, etc. EAL agreed to circulate the presentation.</p> <p>The central premise of the ACP is that Edinburgh Airport will exceed demand in the future. Airport growth since 1983 has been growing steadily and in fact has been growing since the airport opened. Since 1980s the profile of aircraft has changed with fewer military aircraft and the aeroclub closing in 2016. Airlines are now more efficient. Graph shows 1021% passenger growth lead by international travel and long haul routes. Growth forecast to continue. EAL uses airlines intelligence as well as market conditions and trends. Although there was a dip in growth it is anticipated the market will recover based on past performance. Figures at the bottom of one graph in the presentation show predicted growth – 8.1%, 6.7% and 2.8%. EAL are predicting 3.6% growth with passenger numbers of 17.9m up to 2024. EAL stated that their forecasting has been at least 94% accurate since 2016.</p> <p>Should APD be reduced/removed, the forecast would be much greater - possibly 1m passengers per year (EAL agreed to check this figure).</p>	<p>EAL</p>

Day to day basis – peak hourly demand. Arrivals 41%

Capacity used more and more every year. It was noted that on a day to day basis demand is increasing for peak times. It was noted that 41% of traffic is arrivals.

The profile of traffic shows that military traffic is spread across the day and that commercial passenger traffic is driven by demand. The issue for EAL is scheduled demand -v- capacity. Their ability to grow is based on ability to schedule required routes. It was reported that over 75% of air space capacity is reached at some point during the day on 99% of days. This causes a resilience issue for the airport making it difficult to accept more passengers at peak times and therefore growth could be restricted.

For 2020 airline demand is already exceeding capacity. Airlines have requested more slots than available. Alternative slots in the shoulder hours of 5 o'clock or 7 o'clock are being suggested and this tends to work if they are within 15mins of the requested time. The airport is trying to manage this currently through applying peak pricing which has been in place for a couple of years now but the effectiveness of this is now diminishing. It is expected that this will continue being viable until 2020. It was confirmed that moving slots out of the peak time to the night time would be subject to the night time noise charge. Most airlines don't want to fly earlier as there is no demand.

EAL expect to reach capacity by 2022. Demand profile down to market requirements, e.g. passenger demand and airline efficiency targets.

If airline wants to base aircraft at airport, it wants to get slots in the first wave of departures to allow them to complete as many flights as possible before returning at night. If it is unable to get an early slot it is less likely to base the aircraft at the airport.

A forecast slide of what expect demand to be in 2022 was shown. It was noted that Edinburgh not alone in this – Luton, Hamburg, Warsaw planning new airport – all facing maximum capacity. Airline industry demand driven in the main by low cost carriers.

Impact of local/Scottish economy if capacity issues are unable to be resolved. EAL believe it needs to increase air space capacity to meet future demand.

It was reiterated that this presentation focussed on capacity not any potential impact on communities, etc.

Edinburgh Airport has a theoretical departure rate of 30 departures per hour. 3-5mins between planes based on weight, vortex, etc. Overall fleet mix is approx. 75% jets to 25% turbo props. Number of departures per hour is based on the assumption that 1 in 4 departures

<p><b>3.2</b></p>	<p>needs increased separation time. It is assumed that the minimum separation time for larger aircraft is 3 minutes which takes the number of departures to 28 per hour. In reality, the mix of aircraft can be 50%/50% meaning separation times of 4/5minutes resulting in a maximum number of departures of 25 per hour. There hasn't been a situation where there have been 30 of the same type of aircraft being scheduled in the same 1 hour period so that is why the airport cannot hit the theoretical 30 departures per hour.</p> <p>Fleet restrictions can be removed by increasing the number of SIDs and reducing the runway divergence distance from 2 minutes to 1 minute. 2 minutes must be applied to maintain safety during the divergence point of the runway but if you pull that forward and divergence point is closer to the runway then separation can be reduced to 1 minute and you have a 45 degree angle between the 2 aircraft. Therefore any new theoretical departure rate would depend on the design of the new Air Space Change plan and it is important to note that you can't just target 28 as it goes up stepwise depending on separation which is why 1 minute separation helps with capacity. Aircraft would diverge at the end of the runway which is done at the moment to avoid Cramond, theoretically turn at the end of the runway (as is done at Schiphol).</p> <p>The ideal theoretical departures schedule is 60 x 1 minute departures = 60 per hour depending on fleet mix so could be 55 departures per hour. This would be dependent on EAL final design and air space change and the impact that would have on capacity.</p> <p>Additional benefits of capacity would include airport resilience and how it would cope with delays many of which can be outwith the control of the airport. 11% of delays at Edinburgh are due to poor visibility, 14% en route or airport congestion. Increased capacity and 1 minute separation would help the airport cope with delays more quickly by reducing queuing time and reducing further delays.</p> <p>EAL believe that the ACP would give Edinburgh Airport the ability to increase capacity and to grow and meet future demand while improving resilience.</p> <p>With regard to arrivals, EAL agreed to confirm the maximum number that could be handled.</p> <p>The question of safe separation distances for parallel routes was raised. EAL stated that there were no parallel routes at the moment.</p> <p>It was stated that there was a difference between scheduled and actual departure times. Therefore actual should be used for forecasting rather than scheduled. EAL reported that they can only plan on scheduled rather than actual but that they do measure actual.</p>	<p><b>EAL</b></p>
-------------------	---	-------------------

<p><b>3.3</b></p>	<p>The data used to calculate capacity was questioned. For instance, on 8 October there was only 50% capacity used. This was based on rolling hours and showed 2/3<sup>rd</sup> of time the runway was operating at less than 50%. No two hour rolling windows and no one hour rolling windows reached 75% that day. Therefore capacity does not appear to be reached.</p> <p>It was noted that the presentation data was based on an average over the summer 2019 so therefore different data sets had been used. It was stressed that data needed to be taken over a period of time to get an average picture rather than from one day.</p> <p>It was noted that over the summer July rather than August tends to be the busiest month at Edinburgh Airport.</p> <p>It was suggested that growth is stalling. It was noted that Ryanair withdrawing Stansted route which hasn't been replaced yet had impacted on figures. Etihad has also pulled out but Qatar and Emirates are picking this up.</p> <p>Concerns were raised that there could be safety issues on the apron if decreased divergence times were adopted and there were increased flights. EAL stressed that safety is paramount and a key consideration.</p> <p>The question of whether an additional flight path would be required was raised. EAL stated that this was not known at this stage. It may be possible to continue with the existing 3 flight paths depending on way they are configured. ACP would still be required. EAL want to minimise change and impact so will look at all options.</p> <p>It was reported that the EACC minutes dated 16 August stated that the Runway 6 trail had been successful and allowed 1 minute separation without additional flight path. EAL agreed to look into this and report back to the Board with details of the trail and its outcomes.</p> <p>The figures used to calculate and justify the forecast increase in capacity were queried. EAL confirmed that they look at GDP growth (increased GDP is reflected in increased passenger numbers), market conditions, airline requests, etc. This forecasting is used to plan workforce, capital, how run the airport, etc. EAL's 5 year planning has been fairly accurate. Re climate change, EAL will continue to assess what is happening now as well as over next couple of years. They carry out polls in Scotland on people's attitude to airport expansion in general and in relation to climate change. EAL also monitor what is happening elsewhere, e.g. in Scandinavia.</p> <p>It was suggested that there will come a point when there can be no more growth. Also the impact of Climate Change and Brexit are still not known and may well reduce the forecast. EAL stated that longer term forecasts for the economy are good.</p>	<p><b>EAL</b></p>
-------------------	---	-------------------



It was noted that passenger numbers were made up of 60% incoming and 40% outgoing.

It was noted that it was not possible to forecast the type of aircraft that would be using Edinburgh Airport as it was up to airlines to decide on the type of aircraft they use and how they deploy them.

It was noted that it would appear that turbo jets used GOSSAM while turbo props used GRICE. It was suggested that the reasoning behind this be discussed with ERDC

In response to a question on low visibility procedures, it was noted that these included increased separation, runway management, etc.

EAL was asked to provide its definition of sustainable:

- View is growth needs to be achievable - can't be growth for growths sake.
- Make sure demand is met but ensure the business behaves responsibly, meet responsibilities to staff, stakeholders, communities and the environment.
- On a corporate level, meet its environmental, social impact and governance measures.
- EAL was one of the first businesses to adopt the Scottish Government's economics of wellbeing.
- EAL have asked their economists BIGGAR Economics to look at how this can be quantified and measured based on 2019 figures.

A query was raised regarding an earlier statement that the choice of SID depends on route taken by aircraft. However, it was noted that 2 aircraft, same model, both going to Poland albeit different destination airports but one went south on TALLA and one north on GRICE. It was stated that this depends upon usability of the route itself. If, for instance, GOSSAM was really busy, the aircraft could depart on GRICE and then head across North Sea later on. It was also noted that once the aircraft takes off, it is up to air traffic control to determine the best route dependent on weather, traffic, etc.

A question was raised in relation to if the airport is the authority on noise but the airport is not making the decision on where the aircraft fly then who is responsible for the noise being created by these aircraft that are off track.

It is hoped that the Air Space Change process would allow this to be reviewed and give an opportunity to discuss with Air Traffic Control when aircraft are passed onto NATS and at what height and for how long.

3.4	<p>It was stressed that this process would not help those who live under a concentrated flight path especially if departures are increased to 1 minute. Noise concentration would be almost constant.</p> <p>EAL reported that they were recruiting an air traffic controller to their team who could come along and talk to the Board.</p> <p>Early morning flights are mainly departures rather than arrivals. EAL agreed to look into why arrivals were being shown as 1 minute apart on the EAL live departures.</p>	EAL
3.5	<p>In response to a question regarding business passengers, it was noted that the split of passenger traffic had stayed more or less static, i.e. third leisure, third business and a third visiting family/friends.</p> <p>A request was made for the split of aircraft and the times they use the airport, i.e. freight, passenger, empty passenger repositioning, private, etc. EAL agreed to provide this.</p>	EAL
3.6	<p>EAL offered to facilitate a workshop between the Board and the airport's Capacity Manager and the team to go through the presentation in more detail. The Board thanked EAL for this offer and agreed to discuss and get back to EAL.</p>	EANAB
3.6	<p>It was noted that the old unused runway could not be used to help with capacity and is being used to increase stand capacity.</p> <p><b>Airspace Change Programme by Anna Light, EAL</b></p> <p>It was noted that the ACP was a seven stage process the purpose of which is to seek an increase per hour capacity of runway movements by modernising the airspace. It was explained that in 2018 runway 24 was used 69% of the time and runway 06 31%.</p> <p>Stage 1 Step1a Statement of Need was submitted in April 2019 with the assessment meeting taking place in June 2019 and the Step being passed in July 2019.</p> <p>The current stage is Stage 1B which is design principles. The objective of this step is to engage with stakeholders to determine and set the criteria to evaluate the design options. EAL have held 5 initial workshops with stakeholders and 3 with focus groups representing communities. Originally intended 4 workshops to cover the aviation, business, stakeholder and delivery groups and we held additional work group for the EANAB aviation sub group.</p> <p>These workshops were made up of regional representation across Edinburgh, Lothians, Fife, Falkirk, Clackmannanshire and the Borders; industry representation from business, tourism and aviation; health representation from environment health and equalities. EAL</p>	EANAB

<p><b>3.7</b></p>	<p>also held 3 workshops for individuals in communities who are currently overflowed within and outwith noise contours and also those not currently overflowed but could be in the future.</p> <p>The Board asked for clarification of which communities were represented in these workshops, particularly the criteria for inviting individuals/residents and which communities and organisations they represented.</p> <p>Concern was raised regarding transparency of the process in particular in relation to some communities not being invited to send representatives to any workshops or involved in any way with</p> <p>EAL explained that they wanted to engage with communities and people who had been involved in the previous ACP as well as try to engage with people and communities who had not been involved before. EAL employ Progressive Partnership who identify and screen a random sample of people for EAL to engage with who meet the profile provided by EAL. It was noted that the Chair had attend one of the workshops as an observer.</p> <p>Concern was raised that the number of people attending the workshops was relatively small and therefore not truly representative of communities. It was explained that this was the engagement phase and that Stage 3 would be when EAL would go out to fuller consultation including public meetings.</p> <p>A query was raised as to why some individuals were chosen to take part in the recall workshops but not others and that substitutions could not be made if that person was unable to attend. EAL explained that the methodology for the whole process would be detailed as part of the full submission. The recall workshop was made up of a test group.</p> <p>It was felt that it was important to include some people with a knowledge of the planning policy, regulation and the framework governing the ACP.</p> <p>EAL confirmed that details of the workshops, who attended and how they were chosen would be included in the response to the CAA.</p> <p>The Board asked if they would be given the opportunity to comment on the methodology prior to the submission to the CAA. EAL confirmed that they would be making their submission on 3 January and a decision would be made by CAA on 31 January 2020. The CAA would post the submission on their portal but the timescale for this wasn't clear, i.e. whether this would be before or after 31 January. EAL undertook to try to answer any questions regarding the methodology used prior to their submission to the CAA.</p>	<p><b>EAL</b></p>
-------------------	--	-------------------

EAL agreed to let the Board know when they could submit comments to the CAA on the submission. It was thought there might be a 2 week consultation period prior to 31 January but EAL would seek clarification on this and inform the Board.

52 draft design principles emerged from the workshops which were then shortlisted to 16 in a further round of workshops attended by experts from air traffic control, wider airspace environment, ANS operations and internal project teams from noise, environment, community. Some of the draft design principles were similar so these were merged during this process. These 16 design principles were then tested with the 2 recall workshops attended by representatives from the aviation sector and stakeholders/communities. The stakeholders/communities workshop was held first and some changes were suggested which were tested at the aviation sector workshop. Progressive Partnership then reported back to EAL. Additional information/submissions received were considered and analysed. It was reported that the EAL internal governance process is fairly extreme with the Constitution Institute checking the process undertaken. It was also confirmed that the sub board governance process is a new process since the last ACP.

The design process is now being finalised as part of developing the Define Gateway application for Stage 1 which will be submitted by 3 January 2020.

The CAA's decision will be published on 31 January 2020. This gives a 4 week window for the CAA to request any further information. When asked what type of additional information may be requested, EAL stated that, from speaking to other airports, this could be verification of graphs, etc.

The CAA's decision on this stage would be either a pass or fail. If a fail, there will be a list of areas which failed and EAL would need to address these issues and wait for another window to resubmit

In relation of the noise expert involved in the workshops, EAL confirmed that both internal and external noise experts were involved.

If the CAA pass the submission, EAL move on to Stage 2 – develop and assess gateway. Step 2A is options development and Step 2B options appraisal prior to submission on 29 May 2020. Once this has been approved by the CAA, Stage 3 - Consult Gateway – would commence. This would be completed and submitted to CAA for approval by 28 August 2020. The CAA need to approve EAL's communications materials and approach prior to the public consultation commencing.

EAL intend to submit their draft proposal to the CAA by 29 March 2021 with a view to completing Stage 4 ACP full proposal to CAA on 7 May 2021.

	<p>Stage 5 - CAA decision – expected 19 November 2021 and, if approved Stage 6 – ATC training – would then commence followed by AIRAC cycle (change over in technology) which aiming for completion by March 2022</p> <p>Stage 7 Post Implementation Review 12 months after commencement is an important final stage when the CAA will look at how EAL are actually performing against what they said they would do in their original submission. Therefore although the ACP is approved in 2021, completion of the process is 2023.</p> <p>All of the above dates are currently in the ACP and are based on the CAA approving each stage.</p> <p>EAL confirmed that once the CAA gave approval to Stage 3 – Consult Gateway – it would take 2/3 weeks to finalise website, etc., before the public consultation went live. Therefore this would not take place over the summer holiday period.</p> <p>EAL confirmed that Stage 2 -develop and assess Gateway – would ensure that the correct information is contained within the consultation document. It was noted that the previous ACP contained 2 rounds of consultation on flightpaths that the CAA had already rejected.</p>	
<p><b>4</b></p> <p><b>4.1</b></p> <p><b>4.2</b></p>	<p><b>Q &amp; A Session</b></p> <p>It was agreed that EAL would respond by email to the list of submitted questions.</p> <p>The question of noise monitoring reports was raised and EAL agreed to respond separately to this.</p> <p>EAL confirmed that all those involved in the workshops would be given a copy of the final design principles. These would be circulated at the same time as they are submitted to the CAA.</p> <p>Dalgety Bay CC had raised some queries at the workshop and had been informed by EAL that these had been resolved. However, they had not seen any evidence that these had been resolved nor had they seen a copy of the interim draft list of design principles.</p> <p>There being no further questions EAL left the meeting at this point.</p>	<p><b>EAL</b></p> <p><b>EAL</b></p>
<p><b>5</b></p>	<p><b>EANAB Discussion of presentations</b></p> <p>It was noted that there was now extremely limited time for the Board to discuss any course of action prior to EAL’s submission of Stage 1 Step 1B to the CAA on 3 January. This was due to the consistent lack of a convincing response since 23 August to the Board’s many</p>	

	<p>requests for evidence to change their view that there is no need for an increase in runway capacity.</p> <p>It was considered the presentation this evening had not given sufficient evidence that there was a runway capacity issue.</p> <p>The extent to which the CAA would challenge the figures submitted by EAL was questioned. It was noted that under a previous FOI request, the CAA stated they had not seen any data on capacity issues, delays, etc.</p> <p>It was unanimously agreed that a meeting should take place with the analysts who had produced the EAL capacity graphs/information as the outcomes appeared to differ from those produced by the Board. However, concern was raised in relation to the timescale involved and whether there would be sufficient time to organise, attend, consider the outcome and then respond to a workshop as proposed by EAL prior to the submission date of 3 January 2020.</p> <p>The Board strongly felt that EAL should have been able to evidence why the Board's data analysis was incorrect.</p> <p>It was agreed that the Board needed to decide whether it believes the conclusions EAL has made in relation to airport's ability to cope with future demands for capacity.</p>	
5.1	<p>The Board strongly believed that it needed to work closely with EAL but that any requests for information, e.g. capacity, noise, health issues, were not acted upon quickly enough to allow the Board to fully review and respond.</p>	Chair
5.2	<p>It was agreed that EAL would urgently be contacted to arrange a workshop. A sub-group comprising 4 Board members could attend on the evenings of 5, 6 or 11 December asking EAL to explain in detail why the EANAB data is wrong.</p> <p>A letter would be sent to EAL with this request and also stating that if EAL were unable to arrange the workshop sufficiently prior to Christmas to allow time for a considered response, the Board would be writing to the CAA and others to express their concerns regarding EAL's capacity claims enclosing a copy of their own findings. In addition these findings and the letter would be published on the Board's website and circulated to communities.</p> <p>Those attending would circulate their findings and conclusions to the Board as soon as possible after the workshop to allow the Board to finalise its views on capacity and therefore the fundamental basis of the ACP.</p>	Chair
	<p><b>Next Meeting Wednesday 8<sup>th</sup> January 2020 at 6.30pm in the Marriott Hotel for EANAB MEMBERS ONLY</b></p>	

	There being no further business the Chair thanked everyone for their time and closed the meeting.	
--	---	--