

EDINBURGH AIRPORT NOISE ADVISORY BOARD

Minutes of Thirtieth Meeting held on Wednesday 5th February 2020

At the Marriott Hotel, 111 Glasgow Road, Edinburgh

Commencing at 6.30pm

Present: Lindsay Cole, (LC); (Chair)

Merv Archibald (MA), Blackness Area CC; Adam Cumming (AC), Cramond Association; Ray Flint (RF), Kinghorn 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; Pippa Plevin (PP), Uphall CC; Helena Paul (HP), Blackness Area CC/EAW; Andrew Watt (AW), Dalkeith & District CC & Midlothian Federation CC.

In Attendance: Robert Carr (RC), EACC;
June McClung (JM), EAL
Karen Easterbrook (Minutes)

Apologies: Sharon Gibson (SG), Pumpherston CC; Vic Garrard (VG), Kirknewton CC; Ray Godfree (RG), Ratho & District CC; Liz Scobie (LS), Uphall CC; Tom Wylie (TM) Cramond and Barnton CC;
Louise McIntyre (LMcl) EAL

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and introduced Robert Carr who is attending as an observer on behalf of the EACC (Chair).

| ITEM | | ACTION |
|------|--|-----------|
| 1. | Approval of previous minutes It was noted under item 2.25 (28.3.3) text should be corrected to trial (not trail). It was clarified that 3.1 (page 6, last paragraph) should read <i>reducing ATMs</i> and not <i>dropping passenger numbers</i> . RF should also be noted as representing Kinghorn Community Council. On this basis approval of the minutes of the meeting held on 8 th January 2020 was proposed by AW and seconded by MA. | KE |
| 2 | Matters Arising from previous meetings | |
| 2.1 | 29.2.1 It was reported that EAL had requested that any actions attributed to the airport be allocated to members of the Board to follow up with the airport rather than be recorded against EAL in the minutes. It was noted that previously EAL had requested that communication between the Board and EAL be routed through particular individuals (MA and LMcl), therefore this request would require clarification. As there were currently significant outstanding actions against EAL, CM | |

| | | |
|------------|---|-----------------------------|
| <p>2.2</p> | <p>agreed to pull these together on this occasion and contact EAL to resolve as many as possible.</p> <p>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 informal notes taken by the sub-group would also be circulated to EAL. A report from the further meeting held on 6th August to be circulated in due course.</p> <p>Awaiting final comments for the report.</p> <p>It was confirmed the report is being prepared</p> <p>Report received</p> | <p>CLOSED</p> |
| <p>2.3</p> | <p>21.4.4 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> | <p>CLOSED</p> |
| <p>2.4</p> | <p>To be covered under Noise Map Updates.</p> <p>22.6.1 EACC CEO report</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.</i></p> <p><i>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>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. The Chair confirmed that this report would be available in confidence to EANAB members prior to EACC meetings to allow any comments to be forwarded. It was noted that the next EACC meeting would be 10 February which would be open to the public as observers. Chair to contact EACC Secretary to ask that</p> | <p>Ongoing MA/CM</p> |

| | | |
|-------|--|------------------|
| 2.5 | <p>the report be available for circulation in confidence to EANAB members in advance of the EANAB February meeting.</p> <p>It was confirmed that the EACC CEO Report can be released to the EANAB on a confidential basis.</p> <p>It was further noted that the intention is for the CEO reports to be published ahead of EACC meetings to promote transparency and allow questions. The CEO report for Q3 1029 prepared for the forthcoming EACC meeting on 10th February 2020 is now available on the EACC website.</p> | CLOSED |
| | <p>Updates from Sub-Groups:</p> <p>25.4.2 Aviation Sub sub Group Report <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> <i>Can EANAB take these suggestions to ANS?</i> <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. There is a gap between the MoD restricted areas which is not published. They are to be approached regarding this.</i></p> | |
| 2.5.1 | <p><i>RF tabled his key design principals for discussion at the October meeting. Meeting to be set up with ANS regarding flight paths over Midlothian and Fife.</i> <i>AW reported no progress has been made, needs to be escalated.</i></p> | Ongoing AW/RF |
| 2.5.2 | <p>It was noted that ICCAN had published a survey of attitudes to noise at all airports in December 2019 and would be publishing best practice guidance in 2020 as well as a report on noise matrix in April 2020</p> <p>The Chair confirmed he has a telephone call arranged next week with Rupert Basham of ICCAN. Chair to invite ICCAN to February meeting or arrange telephone call between ICCAN and some member of the Board if appropriate.</p> | |
| 2.6 | <p><i>The Chair has spoken with ICCAN who are looking for input from a professional flying perspective and not noise, although nothing has yet been finalised. The Chair should have more information on 9th February (application deadline). The Chair has discussed with ICCAN a representative coming to a future Board meeting, possibly April 2020, and will follow up on this is upcoming discussions.</i></p> <p>ACP Up-date 25.5.1 MA's Questions: <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. JM to email AL as this information request was agreed in the Statement of Need.</i> <i>JM advised that emailing AL and GR would be the most effective way to progress this.</i> <i>Q5.: Email AL/GR</i></p> | Chair |

| | | |
|------|---|------------------|
| 2.7 | <p><i>The Questions and Answers can be shared via the website.</i> EAL analysts are compiling the data. A firm date for the answers was requested as it is crucial information and essential to EANAB. This item to be discussed under Item 3 below</p> | JM/RG Ongoing |
| 2.8 | <p>26.6.2 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. JM offered to follow this up</p> | Ongoing JM |
| 2.9 | <p>26.6.3 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. EAL email to be circulated to members again who should acknowledge receipt and confirm if any comments. Members were thanked for the many responses and it was confirmed that members are happy for the comments to be forwarded to LMcl at EAL</p> | MA |
| 2.10 | <p>26.6.4 Rob Light of ICCAN will be invited to a meeting or skyped in. See 2.5 above. See item 2.5.2 above</p> | CLOSED |
| 2.11 | <p>28.3.1 Should APD be reduced/removed, the forecast would be much greater - possibly 1m passengers per year (EAL agreed to check this figure). Response received from EAL (LMcl) – To be confirmed</p> | MA |
| 2.12 | <p>28.3.2 With regard to arrivals, EAL agreed to confirm the maximum number that could be handled. Response received from LMcl - TBC</p> | MA |
| 2.14 | <p>28.3.3 It was reported that the EACC minutes dated 16 August stated that the Runway 6 trial 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 trial and its outcomes After discussion it was concluded that the minute was not for 16 August, but from the meeting that took place in August 2016. The response from LMcl (EAL) confirms the August 2016 minutes reference Andrew Mather “talking about an increase in 06 departures and the airport advising that no changes had been made to the flight paths, but the frequency of departures had increased. A trial was carried out in early 2016, however, NATS were unable to collect sufficient data and a report with outcomes was not produced.” It was discussed why the trial may not have been repeated and why the trial was reported as successful. It was suggested that perhaps it did not transfer from NATS to ANS. JM to investigate what happened and request it to be repeated.</p> | JM |

| | | |
|------|--|---------------------------------------|
| | <p>There remains an option to put the question to the EACC via the representatives from EANAB)</p> | |
| 2.15 | <p>28.3.4 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. Response received from LMCI requesting that EANAB provide an example of this? This has possibly since been answered in the meeting with Operations Staff where it was explained flights have windows and although there may be multiple flights scheduled for the same time they don't all leave/arrive at that same time. i.e. on our Live Departures/Arrivals page we had three flights all scheduled for arrival at 10.25 this morning but arrived at 10.15, 10.18, and 10.45.</p> | <p>CLOSED</p> <p>MA</p> |
| 2.16 | <p>28.3.5 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. Response received from LMCI – To be confirmed</p> | <p>MA</p> |
| 2.17 | <p>28.3.7 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. Response received from EAL (LMCI). EAL did not agree to EANAB submitting comments on the Submission to the CAA. There may have been some interpretation issues when speaking about EAL</p> | <p>Ongoing MA</p> |
| 2.18 | <p>Governance structure including the EAL Board.</p> | <p>Ongoing MA</p> |
| 2.19 | <p>28.4.1 It was agreed that EAL would respond by email to the list of submitted questions.</p> | |
| 2.20 | <p>28.4.2 The question of noise monitoring reports was raised and EAL agreed to respond separately to this.</p> | <p>CLOSED</p> |
| 2.21 | <p>29.3.1 A note of the meeting was passed to EAL for comments on 3 January. Additional data/information was also requested, e.g. bar charts re-issued with data annotated.</p> <p>29.3.2 It was agreed that a letter would be sent to EAL requesting the outstanding information by 15 January. The data would then be reviewed and the Board would get back to EAL by 18 January with their final position. The final report would then be issued and uploaded to the website on 20 January. It was agreed that a draft letter outlining the above would be circulated for comment before</p> | <p>CLOSED</p> |

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| | <p>issue. The draft letter was circulated and agreed and the agreed letter was duly sent to EAL.</p> <p>29.3.3 It was also agreed that, until EAL had been given the opportunity to provide the outstanding information as noted above, the draft report would remain confidential and could not be shared outwith the meeting. However, in the event of the above timescales not being met, the final report would then be issued and uploaded to the website on 20 January. The relevant material was uploaded to the EANAB website on 20th January 2020</p> <p>Health 29.4.4.1 Meeting arranged with NHS for Thursday 23 January 2020. CAA published in October 2019 a 6 month update on CAP1841 aircraft noise and health effects. The meeting took place as arranged. To be discussed later under issues log</p> <p>29.4.4.2 Latest noise report had been received mid-December 2019. It was noted that noise levels for arrivals and “go arounds” were very high. It was intended to build a picture of noise levels as more quarterly information becomes available.</p> <p>29.4.5.1 Review of Issues Log</p> <p>Issues Champions are asked to update the history column to make it more relevant and up to date.</p> <p>29.4.5.2 Sub-Groups to check they are captured on the Issues Log.</p> <p>29.6.1 Chair to re-issue invitation to Robert Carr of EACC to attend future EANAB meeting</p> | <p>CLOSED</p> <p>Ongoing AC</p> <p>Ongoing TL</p> <p>Ongoing ALL</p> <p>Ongoing ALL</p> <p>CLOSED</p> |
| 3 | <p>Report on EAL data release (AW) Meeting held in December with Operational/Scheduling staff at EAL which answered many questions, but raised some others. In response LMCI (EAL) sent further data on 18 January. Graphs received showing capacity, however, no scale for times of day. Raw data has been requested (scheduled departure and actual departure times), but EAL had responded stating that data cannot be shared as would violate agreements with airlines, despite this data already being in the public domain. RC commented that it may be worth finding out if other ACC and noise boards have access to this type of data and to note that the EACC report is not cast in stone and therefore it is possible to make requests for data to be included.</p> | |

| | | |
|------------|--|-----------|
| <p>3.1</p> | <p>2018 departure data and 2023 forecast data received was also presented. AW highlighted some discrepancies in the data:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • no frequency for 0 departures per (rolling) hour • total number of rolling hours too low • scale on graphs is for cumulative frequency and could be misleading <p>In addition, the 2023 forecast data –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • is labelled June, July, August, but looks like July, August and September data • has much lower total hours of rolling hours, suggesting calculations are on a completely different basis from 2018 data and is therefore not comparable <p>AW explained pitfalls of using peak departures as a measure and showed a comparison with average departures and maximum capacity data.</p> <p>Members highlighted the importance of evidence in discussions with communities, requiring robust data and fair presentation if trust is to be built successfully.</p> <p>Comments made relating to the difficulties EANAB volunteers have experienced in trying to initiate discussions with EAL based on accurate data.</p> <p>Issues relate to inaccurate labelling of data, data being presented selectively, comparisons being drawn between datasets that do not compare like with like. Requests to EAL for data that is already in the public domain have been refused for reasons that are difficult to explain to communities. This data could be extracted in different formats and then converted, but this takes a lot of time from community volunteers.</p> <p>Important that there is agreement on the data underpinning any discussions relating to runway capacity, as the implications for communities for increases in noise from increased numbers of flights are potentially very serious. The current EANAB position being that no evidence has yet been provided that supports a need to increase capacity. Runway capacity is a controversial matter.</p> <p>It was felt that the data projections of flights for 2023 could not be relied upon.</p> <p>The value of independent adjudication of data was discussed.</p> <p>AW agreed to forward report sent by EANAB to the CAA to RC/EACC</p> | <p>AW</p> |
| <p>4</p> | <p>Noise Maps (CM)</p> | |

| | | |
|-----------------------|---|---------------------|
| <p>4.1</p> <p>4.2</p> | <p>CM explained that the assumptions feeding into the model have changed in two ways –</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) vertical profiles have been amended as LGW profiles not typical for EDI 2) it is no longer assumed that aircraft stay on the theoretical SID map lines <p>There was some discussion about the lack of 51dB contour. JM explained that this contour mapping is for the insulation scheme, so 54dB is used. JM confirmed that it would be possible to include a 51dB contour if requested in future, however it was not requested on this occasion.</p> <p>It was noted that WHO guidelines are lower at 40 and 45dB, but that these are not statutory requirements at this time. CM advised 51dB is close to the accuracy limit of the current model. It was agreed that monitoring data would be useful, however this would need to be in addition to meeting requirements for ACP as per CAP1616.</p> <p>JM confirmed there were no additional households within the new 63dB contour (i.e. 63dB and above).</p> <p>A request was made for information on total number of households within the 63dB contour and the number who have applied for or have received insulation. HP to email JM with details of request.</p> <p>It was noted that Annual LEQ and Summer LEQ mapping are not comparable. Summer LEQ is used for insulation.</p> <p>Variations in mapping due to wind direction were discussed and JM advised that 100% load contour mapping, as provided in CAP1616, may be useful, but is not currently used for insulation schemes.</p> <p>EANAB presented a list of requests for data that would be useful for EANAB, particularly kml format and raw data in tables, rather than graphs, noting that ERCD provide data in KML format. CM to confirm request to JM (EAL) by email.</p> <p>Post meeting note: From a subsequent review of previous meeting notes and emails sent to EAL by EANAB, it is clear that consistent and repeated requests have been made by EANAB for noise contour maps to be produced down to and including 51LAeq dbA (in line with the Lowest Observed Adverse Effect Level (LOAEL) set by the UK government in ANG2017.</p> <p>EANAB has not had any sight nor knowledge of any proposals by EAL to map LAeq to 54dbA.</p> <p>The advice by EANAB remains that noise contour maps should be produced down to and including 51LAeq dbA.</p> | <p>HP</p> <p>CM</p> |
| <p>5</p> | <p>Aviation sub group (MA)</p> | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | <p>Main activity has been cross checking data. Key milestone achieved on 18 January when the Board advised EAL to release expert data which was uploaded on to the EANAB website.</p> <p>ACP activity – Noted that EANAB wrote to the CAA and ICCAN on 1st January questioning the Statement of Need (Letter uploaded to EANAB website with supporting documents 20 Jan)</p> <p>The Chair LC updated the Board of the CAA decision that the Stage 1 Gateway had not been passed and that more information was required on design and principles and further clarification needed. More information should be available soon.</p> <p>Members noted that communities are becoming weary of the continued cloud of uncertainty whilst noting that the planning systems do not allow developers to make applications on a continual basis.</p> <p>5.1 Noise sub (sub) group (TL) 2019 Q3 and Q4 reports now available, TL noted that as expected in section 5, maximum noise levels recorded are higher on landing - close to monitor locations. JM offered to split data for arrivals and departures in future reports. It was agreed that this would be useful information.</p> <p>JM explained how Single Event Levels (SEL) are calculated.</p> <p>5.2 Health (AC) Meeting held with Richard of NHS Lothian, Richard is unable to continue with this role as part of his normal duties due to workload and other options are being explored. A useful discussion was had and a report will be circulated.</p> <p>Review of Issues Log A review of issues was not undertaken due to time constraints</p> | <p>JM</p> <p>AC</p> |
| <p>6</p> <p>6.1</p> <p>6.2</p> <p>6.3</p> | <p>AOB</p> <p>A request was made to RC for a copy of the EACC response to the Aviation Strategy Consultation in 2019. Informal observations were made by EACC to the UK ACC who made a submission to the consultation. There was no separate EACC submission.</p> <p>RC noted the CAA consultation on CAP1875 Minimum Requirements for Noise Modelling which closes 4 March 2020. UKACC bulletin can be shared with the Board.</p> <p>The Chair noted that the Planning and Noise report was received from RC and suggested this is dealt with by email outside of the meeting.</p> | <p>Chair</p> <p>CHAIR</p> |

| | | |
|-----|--|--------|
| 6.4 | The Chair reminded the Board that the next EANAB annual report is due soon. Members to update their submissions from last year and send (in a table) to the Chair. Suggested target date for report mid-March. | All |
| 6.5 | JM (EAL) advised that their website was updated over the festive period and now looks quite different. Members to provide JM with any feedback. AW advised of an issue with historical data. | All/JM |
| 6.6 | It was confirmed that the next EACC meeting is being held at 10.30 at the Marriott on Monday 10 February. There will be some space for members of the public | All |
| 7. | DATE OF NEXT MEETINGS: Wednesday 4 March 2020 at 6.30pm in the Marriott Hotel | |
| | There being no further business LC thanked everyone for their time and closed the meeting. | |