

**BIRMINGHAM AIRPORT RUNWAY 33 AIRSPACE CHANGE PROCESS
NOTES OF FRAMEWORK BRIEFING MEETING**

**CAA HOUSE
MONDAY 21ST NOVEMBER 2016 AT 1300 HOURS**

Present:

CAA:

■■■■■■■■■■ Airspace Regulator (Technical & Strategy)
■■■■■■■■■■ ■■■■■■■■■■
■■■■■■■■■■ Airspace Regulator (Co-ordination)

Birmingham Airport Ltd/ Birmingham Airport Air Traffic Services Ltd

■■■■■■■■■■ Head of Air Navigation Services, BAATL
■■■■■■■■■■ Head of Aerodrome Operations, BAL
■■■■■■■■■■ Airfield & Airspace Planning Manager, BAL
■■■■■■■■■■ Corporate Responsibility Manager, BAL

1. Welcome and Introductions

■■■■ welcomed all to the meeting and explained that responsibility for notes of the meeting lay with BAL as the Change Sponsor, and that in the interests of transparency any notes would be made available as a matter of public record if requested.

2. Presentation (see accompanying slides)

■■■■ began the presentation by providing an overview of Birmingham Airport, covering its history, transport links, market and income structure, airline customers and recent investments in infrastructure.

■■■■ introduced the existing R33 procedures, explaining that R33 was Birmingham's preferential runway and was typically used for 60% of annual movements. He detailed the use of three conventional SIDs, namely WHITEGATE (WHI), TRENT(TNT) AND ADMEX/UNGAP/WESTCOTT, which typically account for 16, 16 and 68 percent of R33 departures respectively. He then went on to explain the justification for the proposed change which was due in the first instance to the fact that the SID's are predicated on ground-based VOR infrastructure which will be subject to rationalisation by NATS, but also because of the need for the management of Birmingham's airspace to meet the requirements of wider programmes, in particular the PLAS/FASI North projects. With reference to the latter, he highlighted that in discussions with NATS a new end point for the TNT SID had been agreed at a point currently known as BIMBA and that this had implications for the existing WHI SID.

A number of questions and discussion points arose from these points.

■■■■ asked when the existing VOR system was due to be taken out of service. ■■■■ responded that this was due to happen in the 1st quarter of 2018 in order to fit in with the PLAS programme. ■■■■ observed that PLAS had been brought forward due to delays with other airspace rationalisation programmes elsewhere.

■ asked if there was any potential conflict with East Midlands Airport traffic. ■ explained that there was not, as effectively nothing would change in relation to the SID end point at BIMBA which, in discussions with NATS, BAL had agreed would align with the existing TNT SID. ■ did however explain that there had been internal discussions at BAL about the removal of the existing WHI SID (see below) and the redirecting of traffic that currently uses it onto the new SID replicating the existing TNT SID. These had centred on capacity issues, in that the current situation, where northbound traffic was effectively split 50:50 between WHI and TNT, meant that departing aircraft could be separated by six miles. With all traffic in future following the new SID to BIMBA, traffic would have to be presented at 10 miles separation. It was not envisaged that this would present capacity issues in the short to medium term, but that it may have a potential impact on runway capacity longer term.

■ then presented BAL's design objectives, explaining that they were such that design procedures should be safe, flyable and in line with International Civil Aviation Organisation and Civil Aviation Authority standards and that they should meet the requirements of PLAS. In addition, they should replicate, where possible, conventional SIDs with RNAV designs in order to mitigate the number of new people affected and that in minimising the environmental impacts as far as possible, the focus should be on minimising the impact of noise on densely populated areas below 7000 feet.

■ then went on to summarise the procedure changes, outlining how in discussions with NATS, BAL had agreed that BIMBA should align with the conventional TNT SID, and that an RNAV SID would be designed to replicate it. ■ confirmed that the WHI conventional SID would not be replicated because of difficulties involved in designing it so that it too ended at BIMBA, and that as a result, the proposal was that all northbound traffic from R33 would follow the new RNAV TNT SID. ■ observed that the removal of the WHI SID would lead to a significant reduction in the number of residents overflown.

■ asked if Birmingham's non-radar SIDs would be retained. ■ responded that BAL may not keep them but that the Company was conscious that if they were retained, an RNAV design would be needed. ■ added that they were never used and that BAL had not commissioned designs for non-radar SIDS.

■ went on to explain the issues surrounding the fact that there is a 'published' NPR, which has been in existence for many years, and which communities believe is the 'correct' flight path for aircraft turning south from R33. In reality, this does not match the SID, which brings aircraft further south on the turn than the 'published' route. This results in residents complaining that aircraft are 'cutting the corner', when in fact they are following the correct procedure. ■ further explained that differences in the way RNAV overlays have been designed has resulted in concentrations of aircraft overflying both the northern and southern fringes of the 'published' NPR leading to a significant amount of dispersion (as illustrated in the ADMEX and UNGAP slides). ■ commented that the procedure changes would be an opportunity to bring an end to the confusion that this situation has brought in terms of community perception. ■ asked if the 'published' NPR was associated with a Section 106 Planning Agreement. The BAL team confirmed that it was not and JW observed that the regulator would be content to see it removed.

■ then outlined the situation with MOSUN departures from R33, with which the CAA team were familiar. He explained that the change process involved a formalisation of the existing procedure by the creation of a SID. This would simplify and make the procedure more understandable from a local community perspective. ■ asked how the MOSUN procedure is promulgated. ■ advised that it is the AIP or that pilots were under instruction by ATC.

■ observed that the formalisation of MOSUN will be an issue during consultation and that communicating the fact that there will be no change to what residents on the ground observe will be key. The possibility of more traffic taking this route was also discussed, it being noted that NATS en route were on board with this development as it could potentially take pressure off the Compton sector.

■ asked what work had been undertaken to assess individual carriers' abilities to fly RNAV procedures. It was noted that ■ had completed some work in this regard and ■ observed it would be helpful to get an update. ■ agreed to contact ■ and report back.

■ presented more detail on the initial assessment of the environmental impact of the proposed removal of the WHI4D SID and it was noted that the actual numbers of residents that would cease to be overflowed was yet to be calculated. He then moved on to the initial assessment of the environmental impact of the proposed RNAV TNT4D SID, where it was again noted that it would replicate the existing conventional procedure, that RNAV overlays meant that a good degree of concentration was already being observed and that the draft design of the new RNAV SID indicated no change was expected to the tracks of aircraft over the ground. It was also noted that although traffic on this route would increase by 100%, it would remain the lowest utilised SID.

■ then presented more detail on the initial assessment of the environmental implications of the ADMEX/UNGAP/WESTCOTT SIDs. He reiterated the fact that the current NPR does not conform to the published SID and that this poses a challenge when it comes to replication. He confirmed that it was BAL's intention to come forward with proposals to replicate both the NPR centreline and the SID.

The meeting then went on to discuss the environmental impact assessments of noise, climate change and air quality, where with reference to noise, ■ asked whether BAL was advised to consult on both options or whether it should undertake noise assessments to determine which had the smallest impact before consulting on that just that one. ■ gave his thoughts on this issue and concluded that it was not necessary to consult on both options if clear justification as to why the preferred route was chosen was provided. He argued that the consultation document would need to discuss both options and provide clear evidence as to why one was preferred over the other.

Concerning climate change, it was agreed that noise is the priority and that it was not therefore necessary to undertake a full fuel burn assessment, that SID replication policy does not require a CO2 assessment. On air quality, it was agreed that the new SID's would result in no changes below 1000 feet and that no action was required.

■ then presented BAL's proposals for consultation, including details of the formation of a Focus Group and how membership had been identified, an overview of how responses would be sought and analysed and arrangements for a series of 'roadshows' in affected communities. ■ observed that BAL would be well advised to consider the revised CAP725 process which would be consulted on next year and to incorporate elements of the new process where it could. Specifically he suggested that at an early stage the Focus Group might be asked what their preferences were and what were their expectations and understanding of respite were. He suggested referring to CAP1378 for further understanding of the respite issue and it would be necessary to closely examine the consequences that might follow from suggesting that both routes might be used with the aim of providing respite – would they be far enough apart to achieve meaningful respite and what were the implications if this resulted in more people being overflowed?

■ added that it would be beneficial to consult with those communities who would be positively impacted (eg those benefitting from the removal of the WHI conventional SID) as well as those negatively impacted and that the consultation document should make clear what engagement had taken place.

To conclude the presentation, a discussion about the proposed timetable for the process was discussed. ■ expressed some concern that the proposed timetable would not be sufficient. After some discussion, the general consensus was that the timetable as presented would be acceptable, however ■ agreed to investigate further and to respond to confirm if this was the case.

Concerning the Environmental Impact Assessment, ■ stressed that the proposal would be assessed against the guidance extant at the time the proposal was submitted to the CAA and that BAL would be well advised to keep a watching brief on what might be coming forward in the new guidance.

■ asked what the situation was regarding flight validation and would there be an expectation for flight trials or simulation. ■ responded that a robust programme of simulation would be expected to 'stress-test' the new SIDs to ensure they were fit for purpose with a range of types, weights and weather conditions. It was observed that recent experience had shown that because of different FMS coding, a degree of dispersion was to be expected.

■ thanked everyone for their attendance and input and the meeting concluded at 15:00