

Project Title/No:	DSA ACP/Project No. 5237	Meeting Ref:	CPJ-5237-MIN-063-V1.1
Purpose:	Doncaster Sheffield Airport, ACP Framework Brief	Date:	01 February 2017
Venue:	Mitchell Room, CAA House, London	Time:	13h00-16h15
Attendees:	<p><u>CAA SARG Representatives</u></p> <p>██████████ – Environmental Assessor</p> <p>██████████ – Principal Environmental Assessor</p> <p>██████████ – Airspace Specialist (Coordinator)</p> <p>██████████ – IFP Regulator</p> <p>██████████ – Airspace Regulator (DSA ACP Case Officer)</p> <p>██████████ – IFP Regulator</p> <p><u>ACP Sponsor Team</u></p> <p>██████████ – Peel Airports Management Director of Operations</p> <p>██████████ – ATCSL Air Traffic Services Manager</p> <p>██████████ – ██████████ ACP Project Lead</p> <p>██████████ – Peel Airports Management Environment & Community Officer</p> <p>██████████ – ██████████ ATM Consultant</p>		
Apologies:	Nil		
Distribution:	Attendees		

Notes

Reference	Description
5237-063-N01	Following a round of introductions, ██████████ welcomed the Doncaster Sheffield Airport (DSA) Airspace Change Proposal (ACP) team. He expressed a keen interest in how DSA would wish to develop their ACP with a focus on the proposed timescales owing to the current 'resource hungry' nature of SARG.
5237-063-N02	██████████ thanked all those present for their time and commenced the presentation with an explanation of why an ACP was required. DSA had been informed by NATS that as part of the NATS Rationalisation Programme, the GAM DVOR would be withdrawn by the end of March 2018. The conventional departure procedures depend upon the GAM and therefore RNAV SIDs were required to ensure operational continuity for DSA.
5237-063-N03	██████████ presented a Statement of Need, which stated the requirement to 'Replicate' existing conventional departures with RNAV-1 SIDs to ensure operational continuity and alignment to the UK Future Airspace Strategy. He also advised that DSA are electing to implement RNAV-1 IAPs to compliment the SID replication project. ██████████ queried the assumption that 'Replication' should be done as surely there were other options. ██████████ advised the presentation highlighted varying solutions to the issue at hand.

Reference	Description
5237-063-N04	<p>█ stated that DSA had assumed that this ACP would be judged under the existing CAP725 rules and this was confirmed by █ who advised that the current process would be valid until late summer. █ suggested that DSA apply some of the principles of the emerging CAP725 and █ confirmed that DSA had already considered the impending changes and had adapted their approach to the task accordingly.</p>
5237-063-N05	<p>█ raised the DAP Policy Statement (PS) on 'PBN SID Replication for Conventional SID Replacement' to confirm whether there was any scope for a reduced consultation period in the event the designs were accepted as 'Replication'. █ advised that this PS was under consideration to be withdrawn. Although a full consultation period of 12 weeks (plus allowance for public holidays) had been assumed as appropriate, DSA would need to convince the CAA, and be ready to cover any counter argument from stakeholders, should it wish to reduce this period. █ advised against this course of action but would consider the proposed solutions, take guidance and advise on whether the proposed RNAV design work could be considered as 'Replication'.</p> <p><i>Secretary's Note: DSA is working on the premise that the Replication PS is no longer a valid reference document for this ACP. CAA requested to advise if this assumption is correct.</i></p>
5237-063-N06	<p>One of the assumptions was that a Double AIRAC Cycle would be required for the designs but █ confirmed that the CAA was now content with a Single AIRAC Cycle. █ commented that AIS would need forewarning of the workload if they were also to meet a Single AIRAC and █ agreed to engage with them nearer the time.</p>
5237-063-N07	<p>█ expanded upon the consultation plan to demonstrate who DSA intended to consult, including Natural England owing to the Site of Specific Scientific Interest (SSSI) situated to the north of DSA. █ acknowledged that this was a comprehensive list. █ advised that DSA had 2 Local Airport Consultative Committees (LACCs), one of which was a sub-group which focused particularly on noise. Early engagement with the LACCs was planned.</p>
5237-063-N08	<p>█ described the schedule as presented and █ agreed it was reasonable. █ noted that the consultation and regulatory decision timeframe was later in the year and welcomed this planning as it smoothed his workflow. █ suggested that DSA would be his priority in the timeframes presented.</p>
5237-063-N09	<p>The existing SIDs and PDRs were presented and █ advised that all would require RNAV equivalents apart from the ROGAG 20 North PDR which would be withdrawn. █ enquired why this was. █ and █ advised that it was complex procedure not readily replicated with PANS-OPS design criteria and was used infrequently. Any traffic displacement from it would be so minimal as to be undistinguishable.</p>
5237-063-N10	<p>The NPRs were presented against an Ordnance Survey backdrop showing where 3000ft (the termination point) would be reached using an assumed 8% climb gradient. Runway usage statistics were also presented.</p>

Reference	Description
5237-063-N11	<p>█ advised that DSA had conducted an Equipage and Capability Survey to establish the requirements of the operators using DSA. Initial findings had shown that most could fly RNAV-1 (GNSS) departure procedures although it was likely that an Omni Directional Departure (ODD) would still be required for the operators incapable of using the RNAV SIDs. Track-to-Fix design criteria would be used extensively in the designs supplemented with Course-to-Fix where required.</p>
5237-063-N12	<p>DSA opined that there was a strong environmental case for replicating that which was actually flown (NTK evidenced) off RWY 20 whereas there was a strong environmental case for replicating the published SID off RWY 02. The ROGAG PDR off RWY 02 was more problematic as the NTK data indicated that aircraft were compliant with the Noise Abatement Procedures but were able to out-perform the conservative procedure design parameters intimated by the textual entry in the AIP. The NTK was impossible to replicate yet there were communities that would be affected by reverting to a PANS-OPS interpretation of the published procedure. The procedures were then discussed in turn.</p>
5237-063-N13	<p>RWY 20 – UPTON 1A SID.</p> <p>The DSA ACP team opined that the published SID was not accurately flown as evidenced by NTK data and that the use of unregulated RNAV overlays or radar vectors generally resulted in a better track over the ground from an environmental (noise) perspective. Additionally, the published SID would require a 35-degree Angle of Bank (AOB) if it was to be replicated. DSA proposed that employing a 20 to 25-degree AOB would be optimal, which kept traffic within the current SID protection area. █ questioned why DSA would wish to replicate the NTK instead of the published SID and █ advised that it was preferable to not overfly those who are not currently overflowed when the existing tracks affect less people. █ replied that with PBN procedures there would be greater concentration and improved track keeping resulting in certain people being flown over more often and therefore he highlighted the issues that can arise if trying to minimise the number of people that are annoyed, namely that reducing the overall number of people annoyed by using PBN still can result in some people being more annoyed if are overflowed more often as a result.</p>
5237-063-N14	<p>RWY 20 – UPTON 1B SID.</p> <p>Although this SID is not in regular use, the procedure is required to ensure safe and effective entry to the enroute when the Camphill Glider Box is declared active. The DSA ACP team opined that the published SID was easily replicated with only a slight amendment at the second turn to use a shallower and more appropriate 25-degree AOB. The replication would sit within the published NPR. Other than a query relating to the requirement for this procedure there were no further questions asked.</p>

Reference	Description
5237-063-N15	<p>RWY 20 – ROGAG 20 South PDR.</p> <p>It was presented that the PDRs were not a charted departure route and therefore difficult to ascertain what the intended track ought to be. On the basis that the NTK data indicated a common swathe of aircraft similar to the PDR text it could be assumed that designing “what is flown” would be a reflection of ‘Replication’. [REDACTED] stated he felt the NTK data was not sufficiently filtered to prove this. There was not clear agreement as to what the presentation could display but there were clear indications on the track where traffic flowed. [REDACTED] advised that DSA’s NTK capability had its limitations which proved difficult to show indicative traffic flows. [REDACTED] advised that the NTK system was shortly due for renewal. [REDACTED] provided further explanation of where the NTK data showed that there was a clear case to use a track between 20 and 25-degrees AOB as it followed that which was flown today which should result in an environmental improvement (in terms of reducing the number of people overflown). The DSA team sought guidance on PDR replication as there does not appear to be any CAA guidance material or policy statements to cover these published procedures. SARG was unable to offer any specific guidance other than to say the DAP PS on Replication did not cover PDRs. It was agreed, that the NTK would be reviewed to obtain a more refined depiction of the track flown routinely by aircraft using this PDR by reducing the NTK data to a shorter period.</p>
5237-063-N16	<p>RWY 02 – UPTON 1C SID.</p> <p>The NTK data clearly showed that aircraft were not currently following the published track of this SID. Aircraft were routinely following a track that cut inside the turn resulting in overflight of built up areas that the SID had been designed to avoid. It was DSA’s intention to replicate the published procedure to concentrate traffic on the published nominal track and in so doing lessen the environmental impact. There were no objections to this proposal.</p>

Reference	Description
5237-063-N17	<p>RWY 02 – ROGAG 02 PDR.</p> <p>Research revealed that replicating the ROGAG 02 would be problematical. Analysis of the tracks actually flown by aircraft indicated that they were not designable within PANS-OPS criteria. Furthermore, should a PANS-OPS design be employed, analysis indicated that it would result in several communities (namely Wroot, Westwoodside and Haxey) being overflown that were not overflown today. Four potential solutions were offered for discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Replication of the intended PDR using PANS-OPS criteria; • Use a design brief that avoided Westwoodside; but it was not ideal and resulted in a nominal flightpath close to Wroot and not sufficiently far enough away from Westwoodside; • Use a Course-to-Fix leg with 2 AOB options (20 or 25 degrees) in a bid to try and replicate the NTK tracks but again neither was ideal; • Finally, develop a hybrid borne of the second and third solutions in an attempt to avoid as many built up areas as possible. The hybrid resulted in overflight of a portion of the SSSI although it was captured within the existing NPR swathe. The communities of Wroot, Westwoodside, Haxey and Gringley-on-the-Hill would all benefit from the implementation of this option. <p>It was further explained that all the solutions provided relief to Blaxton which is overflown by a large number of departures turning east. [REDACTED] was of the view that what was proposed could not be viewed as a 'Replication' but that it was ultimately up to the DSA team to put together their case.</p>
5237-063-N18	<p>[REDACTED] suggested that the NPRs may be continued to 4000ft. [REDACTED] advised that there were pros and cons associated with this as the concentration of traffic would be extended (this may be a good or a bad thing depending on the location of the 4000ft point). [REDACTED] suggested that DSA may have to consider respite options depending on the emerging guidance from the Department for Transport (DfT). [REDACTED] recommended that DSA make some reference to respite in their submission and how the use of it had been considered. [REDACTED] advised that the DfT was to commence a consultation on airspace and aviation noise in the coming days.</p>
5237-063-N19	<p>RNAV IAPs.</p> <p>[REDACTED] presented the intention to implement RNAV IAPs with simple final approach tracks. [REDACTED] questioned the absence of T-bars to which [REDACTED] responded that the tactical vectoring employed today helped the unit remain flexible in airspace that saw a high degree of airspace infringements. [REDACTED] enquired whether this would constitute a change in the traffic pattern as this would determine the level of consultation required. [REDACTED] opined that the insertion of T-bars may indeed change the traffic pattern. [REDACTED] stated that use of T-bars may inadvertently take aircraft closer to the edge of the CTR/CTA boundary reducing safety margins. [REDACTED] recommended that track density plots were required to aid the understanding of what happens today and that shorter data windows should be used. [REDACTED] advised that the implementation of RNAV IAPs was a contingency procedure as the CATIII ILS would still be the primary means of approach. [REDACTED] advised that if this were the case then there would be very limited change and there would be a reasonable case for not requiring consultation on the IAPs.</p>

Reference	Description
5237-063-N20	On presentation of the Opportunities and Issues, [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] challenged the view that there was the potential to improve the environmental impact as the potential solutions may result in noise improvements but at the expense of CO ₂ , fuel burn and emissions owing to a slight increase in track distance. [REDACTED] acknowledged this but his greater concern was those affected by noise up to 4000ft and this aligned with extant DfT policy. [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
5237-063-N21	[REDACTED] sought confirmation of what environmental metrics would be required. [REDACTED] advised that this would depend on whether a route was considered a 'Replication' or not and what had been presented may mean that the expectation might be mixed. At the very least, diagrams that conveyed noise impacts up to 7000ft would be required. If there was little change in the initial part of a SID, it was unlikely that the Leq contours would change significantly and therefore may not need doing. Unless there was an intention to introduce night flights, the SEL footprints would not be required.
5237-063-N22	A discussion over the 'Replication' policy followed as to whether part of the ACP solution could be considered as 'Replication' and dealt with accordingly, i.e. reduced consultation. The remaining elements of the ACP, where there was no clear evidence of 'Replication', a full consultation was required. There was agreement in that where no change to the existing nature of flights that the ACP could be limited in those portions. <i>Secretary's note: On balance, it was clear that 'Replication' could not be applied to all routes. It could prove contentious if the change proposal did not deal with each route and the affected communities in an equitable manner. A full explanation of how each route has been considered and how the options were developed to achieve the preferred solution shall be provided in the Focus Group work and subsequently included in the narrative of the consultation material.</i> <i>Notwithstanding, where close replication of the current route could be produced that should be the default position.</i>
5237-063-N23	[REDACTED] concluded the main meeting and most SARG participants vacated the room. [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] remained to run through the CAP725 process. [REDACTED] requested that a completed set of minutes, together with a redacted version, were sent to SARG within two weeks which [REDACTED] agreed to. [REDACTED] confirmed that there was no requirement to publish the Framework Brief presentation slides.

Decisions

Reference	Subject	Description
5237-063-D01	CAP725	The existing CAP725 process will be used for this ACP. [5237-063-N04]
5237-063-D02	AIRAC	A Single AIRAC Cycle may be used for the procedures. [5237-063-N06]
5237-063-D03	Schedule	The schedule as presented was acceptable to the SARG Case Officer. [5237-063-N08]

New Actions

Reference	Description	Owner	Due Date
5237-063-A01	Provide DSA guidance on whether what was proposed could be considered as Replication. [5237-063-N05]	█	15 February 2017
5237-063-A02	Provide SARG with a set of Framework Brief Minutes (and a redacted version). [5237-063-N22]	█	15 February 2017

Next meeting

Date:	TBC	Time:	
Venue:			