

**East Midlands Airport
Independent Consultative Committee (ICC)**

Monitoring, Environment, Noise and Track (MENT) Sub-Committee
Friday 17th February 2023
Via MS Teams

Present

Independent Chair	Mr G Liguori
Independent Secretariat	Mrs C Pull

Organisation

Melbourne Civic Society	Dr P Grimley
PAIN – People Against Intrusive Noise	Mr R Sutton
WHICH	Mr I Jones
DHL Aviation Ltd	Mr A O'Neill
SAVE	Mr E Green
Nottinghamshire County Council	Cllr M Barney
Loughborough University	Mr A Timmis

East Midlands Airport (EMA)

Head of ESG and Environmental Strategy	Mr A Freeman
EMA Community Engagement Manager	Ms C Hempson (CH)
Group Flight Evaluation Unit (FEU) Advisor	Ms D Patton (DP)
Group Flight Evaluation Unit (FEU) Manager	Mr D Smith (DS)
Head of Asset Development - Utilities, Energy & Environment	Mr T Rix (TR)
Future Airspace Consultation Senior Project Manager	Ms S Robinson

Absent and Apologies

Leicestershire County Council	Cllr T Pendleton
Kings Newton Residents Association	Mr S Leech
Rushcliffe Borough Council	Mr A Edyvean

The meeting commenced at 1000.

1 Introduction and Apologies

The Chair welcomed all to the meeting and apologies were recorded.

2 Declaration of Interest

No declarations of interest were reported.

3 Minutes of the last meeting

A member highlighted an inaccuracy on page 4 paragraph 4 regarding the Wilson noise monitor. Secretariat will replace the word “fines” with the word “reports”.

The member also raised an inaccuracy on page 7 paragraph 3 around aircraft flying off course. Secretariat will add the wording “aircraft reported as flying east of Wilson”.

The previous minutes will be taken as approved when the above amendments have been made.

3a Matters arising

The Chair asked for comments on matters arising.

Action 3a (confidential marking process) is carried over to the next meeting.

Action 5(i) (Atkins report) is complete.

Action 5(ii) (AECOM model data sharing) is carried over to the next meeting.

Action 5(iii) (sharing of Water Research Council research) is carried over to the next meeting if not closed before this date.

Action 6(i) (UKACC view of 2021 noise mapping data) The Chair provided an update and will report back by email to members should there be a further update.

Action 6(ii) (NAP Questions) is complete. The Chair asked the Airport to confirm the number of responses received, along with detail if they can share by 10th of March.

Action 7 (Answers to Noise Penalty questions submitted by Chair on 30/09/22) is carried over to the next meeting.

Action 8 (Kings Newton training flights) is complete.

Action 9(i) (Westerly Departure issue) to be deferred to June 16 MENT – Chair to email Simon to see if he still wants to provide the detail or whether we can close the action. UPDATE: The Chair emailed SL on 17 February 2023, and SL asked to mark the action as closed

Action 9(ii) (ATC visit) is complete.

The action raised in AOB around the Diseworth parking issue is complete.

The action in AOB around Future Agenda Items can remain open for future meetings.

4 An update by the Chair

The Chair gave an update on the waste-water management issues. He was joined by other members and DRAC representatives at a meeting with Airport

Senior Management. TR took attendees through a presentation which included surface water improvement plans and an operational overview. A site visit was carried out, which included wastewater ponds. The Airport emphasised that they want a positive and open dialogue with members and local residents. The recently expanded team are very committed to their work and have assured they now have better improved data-driven processes and aim to drive better performance and increased levels of assurance with proactive and dynamic water waste management. Water waste management now features on the corporate risk register. The Chair feels assured that significant steps have been taken to manage the process better going forward. He believes that it's right to look at the present and future rather than the past. This is a standing item on the MENT agenda. He thanked the Airport and members who attended for their time.

On the 13th of January, The Chair attended a meeting with community representatives and airspace change (ASC) team members, chaired by Neil Robinson. The discussion was around the concerns certain local communities have over Airspace Change and current routes being drawn up. Questions were asked and concerns taken away. The ASC team will consider the discussions that took place as a part of the process that is CAP 1616.

The Chair informed members that there is an ongoing dialogue between the Melbourne Civic society and the Airport on noise-related issues.

Action 4 – The Airport to provide an update to questions raised in the noise survey report and departure route noise abatement report produced by Melbourne Civic Society ahead of the next MENT meeting.

The Chair thanked Paul Kay and his team for taking members on their recent ATC tour.

The Chair was asked by UKACCS to be a representative of the Airspace and Noise Engagement Group noise and has agreed. There are 3 meetings per year and he will share the minutes of these meetings with the committees.

5 Water Management Update - including De-icer project

A presentation was circulated and is available on the ICC Member SharePoint Portal.

TR took members through the presentation and highlighted the following points.

January was challenging due to cold and wet weather which caused capacity issues. Volume of water being discharged into Diseworth led to minor concerns regarding flooding. EMA managed the discharge in a controlled manner including dispatching staff to monitor water levels in Diseworth itself. This proactive management facilitated a constructive dialogue with residents of Diseworth and specifically members of the Diseworth Flood Group.

An overview of the winter period will be provided at the next meeting.

The de-icer capture project is now fully up and running with significantly better results than had been anticipated. Data is being collected and will be reported on later in the year.

The water quality monitors currently being used are old technology. The work with the water research council looked at what could be done to improve this and positive steps have already been made onsite.

There has been a small setback on the surface water model, however, the June update should still be on schedule to go ahead.

The team are already looking forward, planning for next winter.

A member asked it to be noted that he is the only member present today from the sub-group that met to discuss water quality. He advised that he found the meeting on 14th December very helpful and requested further technical meetings be arranged with DRAC present.

The member welcomed the commencement of the new de-icer process and asked about the differences between the de-icers used on airframes and on the ground. TR explained that the glycol-based de-icers that are applied to airframes are more challenging to deal with as they have a higher BOD which means it uses more oxygen from water as it breaks down. De-icer applied to the runway is potassium acetate based which has a lower BOD and breaks down more easily.

The member also asked for further detail to what measures are being taken in the medium term (slide 2 green, yellow and red indicators).

Action 5 (i) - The Chair to contact TR to arrange another virtual session of the working group before 31st May 23 as requested by a member.

Action 5 (ii) - TR agreed to provide more detail on 'Performance to Date' slide (green, yellow and red chart) in the next report.

The member raised concerns about the Diseworth Brook and this transferring a problem into the rivers Soar and Trent. He referenced an article in FT about the underfunding of the Environment Agency and examples at the Airport.

The Chair commented that the article was from November 2022 and understood that the Airport has already had sight of this.

A member queried if, as a longer-term plan, the fluid from aircraft be collected directly from the aircraft as it comes off rather than needing to sweep it up. TR advised that MAG is investigating using de-icer pads for all sites as a contained drainage solution. These allow the de-icer to be collected, contained and recycled and utilised elsewhere. This would be difficult to implement as a standalone project but could be considered as part of wider airfield change projects.

AF commented that the airport has come a long way with this issue since the article was published. It's important to recognise that the data shared by TR today shows compliance which is a different story to that reported in the FT article. TR is able to show progress at each MENT meeting. AF wants to make it clear that the airport does see the risk in this area and is working hard to continually improve this.

The Chair agreed with AF's comments and noted that the airport is engaged with the local community and is clearly making progress and notably this matter is part of the EMA corporate risk register, so this should be an assurance that this work will continue to be of utmost importance.

6. Noise Action Plan Update (NAP)

DS took members through a presentation. Slides are available in the ICC Member SharePoint and were emailed to members immediately after the meeting. The Chair asked if there could be a further update at the next MENT meeting. DS advised this will be provided.

Action 6 (i) - a NAP progress update to be provided at the next MENT meeting.

Action 6 (ii) Airport to confirm the number of responses received to the questions raised in the NAP paper written for 30/09/22 MENT, along with any detail they can share by 10th of March.

A member queried how the NAP can precede the Sustainable Development Plan which provides the projected numbers of aircraft movements. AF advised that the NAP and Sustainable Development Plan (SDP) are being developed and that the airport are aware of this issue. The NAP is required to deal with the noise as mapped in the year defined by DEFRA, which has been agreed at MENT is not a typical year, hence the airport is introducing additional noise metrics into the report.

A member raised a point about EMA being busier in 2021 and asked if members could be informed on what the supplementary data for the EMA NAP will be at this stage. DS advised that this was covered in a paper at the September MENT meeting and members were asked to provide suggestions and ideas on supplementary metrics to be used. He has not had any visibility of anything received from members, so asked again for input. There have been significant changes during the pandemic around freight fleet mix which will be addressed in the NAP, with things returning to normality now with freight moving back to belly hold at Heathrow.

7 Portable Noise Monitoring

A paper on the Summer 2022 portable noise monitoring report was circulated and taken as read.

DP took members through a presentation. The paper and presentation are available in the ICC Member SharePoint and emailed to members.

Results have been circulated from the portable monitor in Breaston. There were some power-out issues on-site at this monitor location which created gaps in the data. The levels recorded were below the Lowest Observed Adverse Effect Levels for aviation noise, as defined in CAA guidance.

With regards the next portable noise monitor site, DP highlighted the conditions that must be met for monitor location sites. DP shared the details for applications received for monitors and explained the reasons for the airport's recommendation on priorities. The airport's recommendation is that the Barrow on Trent and Smisby locations would be the best of those that have made applications due to the reasons discussed and outlined in the presentation.

DP asked members for feedback on which of these proposed locations they believe would be most suitable for monitoring so that they can be deployed by early June 2023. CH asked that these be directed to her by email.

Action 7 (i) – members to send feedback on which of the proposed locations should be selected for the monitor location to CH by 1st March 2023

A member praised the quality of the Breaston noise report and asked for a similar analysis of the data taken at the Wilson, Weston Trent and Sutton Bonington monitors, so the information can be compared. This comparison would provide information which would be useful information for residents local to the existing monitor sites. DP advised that the portable noise monitor is produced in this way because it is not included in the existing permanent monitor reporting regime.

She suggested that a more detailed case study of permanent monitors may be included as part of the NAP.

The member also raised that the report is complex and may be difficult to understand for Breaston residents and Councillors. DP advised that there has already been a meeting with Breaston Parish Councillors to go through this information.

A member thanked CH for her work with the 5 Parish Group.

As West Leake is not part of this group, he would support their request for a monitor as the whole village is more directly under the flight path than other areas, such as Sutton Bonington. He asked if there is a chance of a monitor being placed there in the future. He also suggested the same for East Leake as it is a more densely populated location. DP advised that if West Leake is not successful this summer, they will be kept on the list and looked at again in the future. She advised that the process for requesting monitors has been shared previously with the parishes. Any parishes wishing to request a monitor should go through the process and they will be added to the list. The member asked to be kept in the loop. DP agreed she will do this.

Action 7 (ii) – CH to send details about how to apply for a mobile noise monitor in East Leake to Cllr Barney.

A member stated that he's happy to go with the airport on the selection of the next site.

A member pointed out that might be useful to look at the noise complaints analysis data for picking out monitor sites, rather than waiting for sites to

approach the airport. DP advised that this data is already used and this has resulted in applications being received from those parishes that have raised complaints. Regular complainants are advised to do this as standard.

A member asked if the documentation could be sent out showing details of the potential new locations. DP advised these slides will be shared following the meeting and that they are already available in SharePoint.

8 Environment reports

A paper was circulated and taken as read. Paper and presentation are available on SharePoint and emailed to members.

DP talked through the presentation and advised members that there is some additional information included on the 09 Trent departure issue.

A member raised a question on the graph showing complaints. As the majority of these come from only a few complainants, he asked what action the airport takes to appease them. DP explained the process for all complaints received, including the regular complainants. AF added that some committee members have been supportive in these cases and have offered to become involved in independent dialogue with the two regular complainants, but there has been no response.

A member raised a question on the QC4 fines. He advised that members were told at the previous MENT meeting that these aircraft had ceased to operate. He noted that UPS is regularly operating some 747s at night, some of which he believes are QC4 and which believes shows that the fine process isn't successful as UPS introduced some of these aircraft after the fines had been introduced. DP responded that UPS operate 747-8 and 747-400. The latter is QC4 on departure and UPS has ceased operations of that aircraft at night. The member stated that he believes this aircraft has operated at night during this week. DP responded that she believes that no QC4 departures for Boeing 747-400's have taken place after 11pm. The member believes that he noted these departures on the 15th & 16th of February. DP asked the member to provide information and she will look into it and respond.

Action 8: Member to send DP/DS the detail of the QC4 UPS 747-400 flights that he believes departed after 11pm on the 15th & 16th of February and copy in the Chair. Post meeting note – the member sent a list dates and times that he noted UPS B747-8 take-offs, these were on 14th and 16th February. DS responded by email on 17 February with a clarification that 747-8s are QC2 on departure. There had been no QC4 747-400 variants operating at night. A report of all UPS night departures from 1-16th February was provided demonstrating that all aircraft were B747-8 and therefore QC2 on departure. The member accepted the clarification and apologised for the confusion.

The member also commented that the continuous climb approach may not always be the best option for flights departing over highly populated areas.

DS explained the definition of continuous climb and advised that this has previously been explained to members.

The member stated that the noise monitor report doesn't show what is happening around the Wilson area and believes the fining figure and information provided is meaningless to the residents of this area. He believes there is a discrepancy between with noise monitor report and the peak noise event report. DP clarified the differences between these reports and advised that the reports were agreed with MENT following the previous NAP. If members believe the noise monitor reports should be amended, this could be addressed through the next NAP.

The member highlighted that NAP22 says that the peak noise report will be used to challenge performance with operators and explore options to reduce noise. He asked if operators are being challenged and asked for evidence of this. DP advised that operators are being challenged, this is evidenced in the reports shared and through fines issued to carriers.

The Chair advised that there is an item at the next MENT on noise fines which may answer the member's questions.

A member thanked DP for her presentation and queried track keeping on the 2012 map. He asked if aircraft were "cutting the corner" at this point on the westerly turn. DS responded that there will always be a degree of variation due to conventional procedures which are largely based on ground navigational aids. The turn off the 09 Trent is further complicated by requirement that before aircraft turn north, they must first turn five degrees south, this is in the AIP plate to avoid Kegworth as much as possible. This means there will always be a degree of variation. For the 09 Trent route the correction or track to the VOR which is magnetic delineation which has occurred over the years. The Earth is moving at 0.14 degrees towards true north from magnetic in a year on average, so there has gradually been a shift in magnetic track over time. This will continue to change over time for this reason but will be solved with Future Airspace and new RNP satellite systems which won't be subject to magnetic variation going forwards. The member is grateful for the southerly turn which is important but is mindful that if the variation could become less then that will help everybody concerned.

The member asked if any noise fines have been issued on the Trent 09 route. DP responded that there have been several fines issued from data received from the Sutton Bonington noise monitor. All monies received are put into the East Midlands Community Fund for local projects.

A member had issues asking questions due to microphone issues but agreed to email his question to DP following the meeting and copy the Chair.

Post meeting note - the member's question was submitted and answered. The question related to Departure Track Summary Reports for Q3 & Q4 2022 and queries about repeat offenders. He asked how the airport engages with airlines with lower track-keeping compliance. He asked whether they have older navigation systems, if there are any penalties and what the airport does to improve airline track keeping.

DP replied that the airport engages with airlines with track keeping non-compliance and provided a number of examples of this engagement. All airlines receive detailed reports on a monthly basis showing their compliance

with these measures. For some airlines their final destination has an impact on their overall track keeping compliance. Airlines that use the Trent departure routes more are much more impacted by the 09TNT departure route issues while their performance on other routes will be good. The airport monitors and reports all airline performance and finds that using positive engagement is the best way to improve track keeping performance, however if they find an airline is not being supportive or responding to requests for track keeping improvements, they do have the mechanisms in place to levy charges on persistent non-compliance of track keeping.

9 Future Airspace Update

A paper was circulated and taken as read. This paper is available on SharePoint.

SR introduced herself to members and advised she would provide a summary of the paper. She advised that a further update will be provided at the next MENT meeting.

There were no questions.

10 AOB

AF pointed out 2 consultations which may be of interest to members:

1. A call for evidence launched by the CAA on 11th January 2023 on consumer environmental information. This is driven by the Jet Zero Strategy and the closing date is the 7th of April 2023.
2. A call for evidence launched by the DFT on 7th February on zero emission airports by 2040. This is an important strategy and the closing date is the 2nd of May 2023.

The Chair advised links to both these are in the first page of the bulletin he circulated on the 16th of February. He is happy to work with members should they wish to put a submission in.

The Chair thanked everyone for their time.

11 Date of next MENT meeting

- Friday 16th June 2023

There being no further business the Chair declared the meeting closed at 1200