

## Stage 5 Clarification Questions for Inverness ACP2014-04 following the submission of the June 24 Addendum.



Submission Document Name, Page/Para	Question/Issue	Tech/Conslt/ Env/Econ/ ATM/ General	Date	Response
Addendum Para 2.1	<i>Position IFR passenger-carrying airliners more accurately allowing arrival and departure routes to be flown more precisely (hence impacting fewer people) – Has a study been carried out to determine if 'fewer people' will be impacted as a result of the changes or is this statement a qualitative opinion based on the likely concentration of tracks following RNAV procedures?</i>	Tech/Env		<i>This statement is a qualitative opinion based on the likely concentration of tracks following RNAV procedures. Inverness have sought to minimise the population impacted under the proposed routes compared to existing procedures by rationalising the current 'vectored' or 'procedural' approach and departures and routing over more sparsely populated areas, including longer over water tracks than was previously the case.</i>
Addendum Section 3, Figure 1	Figure 1 now shows CTA9 as Class D 200-5500. Please confirm that this was CTA 11 as described in the ACP? Has this been changed to ensure numerical order of the airspace structures?	Tech		<i>Yes, CTA 9 replaced CTA 11 and Class D is 2000-5500.</i>
Addendum Section 3.4	Please provide an assessment on the amended BONBY RWY23 transition regarding impact on stakeholders and draw a conclusion with rationale on whether the modification justifies re-consultation.	Conslt		<i>The amended BONBY Runway 23 transition now commences a later descent at PEN 02 which keeps the aircraft at a higher altitude for longer. To ensure appropriate levels of safety are maintained by remaining within the confines of CAS, the inbound track has required an amendment to ensure that there is enough track distance to maintain a CDA by keeping the portion of the newer track between 7,000ft and 3,300ft and route over water and sparsely populated areas. The Change Sponsor does not believe that this change necessitates re-consultation for this route as there is no significant increase in the number of stakeholders overflown as the route has been</i>

				<i>specifically designed to maximise the proposed track over water and minimise the distance flown in the quieter descent over land.</i>
Addendum Section 4	Please can you provide additional information regarding the noise differential between the Embraer E170 (E175) (modelled as the noisiest aircraft for the 2017 SEL footprints) and the E190 which I understand is currently being integrated into the fleet. Please could you also indicate how this integration is being progressed in terms of relative aircraft numbers.	Env		<p><i>The E190 is reasonably similar in terms of noise to the A319 and A320 that currently operate. The noise differential between the E170(E175) and the E190 is as follows:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>• The E190 is 1.2-1.6 dB noisier on departure (average +1.3 dB)</i></li> <li><i>• The E190 is 0.2-1.7 dB noisier on arrival (average +0.8 dB)</i></li> </ul> <p><i>Noise measurement data from another UK airport provided by ERCD indicates that E190 aircraft are on average about 1 dB noisier than the E170. Whilst there is a very minimal increase in noise levels, this would be offset by the CDA and CCO design as described above and within the ACP Amendment document. Integration is currently being conducted by the main operator KLM and is dependent on route usage and passenger numbers. Currently, the Summer period is mainly E190s but E170s are expected to be used in the winter as in previous years.</i></p> <p><b>Winter period (Nov-Mar)</b>  <i>Inbound – 150  Outbound – 150  E190 – 85  E175 – 215</i></p> <p><b>Summer period (Apr-Oct)</b>  <i>Inbound – 390  Outbound – 390  E190 – 220</i></p>
Addendum Section 4	The Addendum details proposed track changes to SID BONBY Rwy 05, GARVA Rwy 05 Transition, BONBY Rwy 23 Transition and GARVA Rwy 23 Transition which have been designed to maintain CCDs and CDAs within CAS whilst minimising noise impacts on built up areas. Can you confirm whether the amended proposal will still align with the analysis forecast in the 2017 ERCD Report that the ACP will result in a small overall reduction in fuel burn and CO2 emissions?	Env	11 Jul 24	<i>Yes, although the track miles have increased slightly in some instances, there is still an overall small reduction in fuel burn and emissions where CDAs and CCOs will be enabled. For arrivals, the aircraft will fly predicted routings from a higher altitude under a CDA and routings have been modified to remain further away from populated areas and will not be expected to be vectored should a potential unknown conflict appear whilst</i>

				<i>being controlled by ATC under a deconfliction service. This is also the case for departures.</i>
Addendum Para 5.1	You have provided data on total aircraft movements and commercial air transport movements. In the Oct 21 meeting with the CAA and the Dec 22 update (both on the CAA webpage for ACP2014-04) the threshold figure was agreed as passenger air transport movements (PATMs). Can you confirm that in 2023 you reached at least 80% of the 2019 total PATMs which was 12473?	Tech/GeP		<i>Inverness can confirm that during 2023 it attained 81.16% of the 2019 figure. The figures presented in the Addendum were based on the CAT movements and used for comparison purposes. The author of the Addendum was unaware that PATM would be used as the threshold figure. There were 10,123 PATMs during 2023.</i>
Addendum Para 6.3.1	Please provide the CAA with a copy of the minutes from the Oct 23 HazID meeting in order for us to determine who the SMEs were.	Gen		<i>The minutes are attached.</i>
Addendum Section 7	There is no mention of ongoing engagement with NERL and Prestwick Centre (PC)? Please provide an update on what engagement has taken place and if it has contributed to the ongoing ACP development, including the development of any relevant LoAs and that NERL (PC) are aware of the planned implementation date?	Tech/Gen/Conslt		<i>NERL and PC have been involved and are aware of the proposed implementation date. The LoA will be updated post CAA decision and a meeting to discuss potential amendments is in the process of being arranged by PC for the end of July, subject to their rostering requirements.</i>
Addendum Para 7.1	Please provide the CAA with the relevant sections of the minutes from the RAUWGs mentioned in para 7.1.	Conslt		<i>The minutes are attached.</i>
Addendum Para 7.7	Request for clarification regarding reference to the LoA with HHGPC requiring slight amendment should the ACP be approved.	Conslt		<i>A slight amendment will be required to the recently agreed and signed LOA that recognises the Class D airspace if the ACP is approved.</i>
Addendum Para 7.8	There are references to Easter airfield in the Safety Case Pt1 (para 4.4.2), however, there is no mention of Easterton Highland Gliding Club); has any engagement taken place?	Gen/Conslt		<i>Yes previous engagement took place with Easterton who are aware of the ACP; however, the HAZID identified that there would be no particular impact on Easterton Airfield and therefore it was deemed an LoA with Easterton was not required to ensure ongoing safety.</i>
Addendum Para 7.9	Reference to copy of communication issued to stakeholders being found on the ACP portal. Should the reference be to the CAA's website rather than the portal?	Conslt		<i>Yes it is on the CAA webpage for the Inverness ACP.</i>
Addendum Para 7.9	Does the reference to ACP update sent to stakeholders 10 March 2024 relate to the letter dated 27 February 2024?	Conslt		<i>Yes</i>
Addendum Para 7.9	Were any responses received from stakeholders to the update of February/March 2024. If yes, please can copies be provided.	Conslt		<i>Whilst the update and response channel was well published, there was no feedback apart from HHGPC who agreed and signed the LoA for Operations at Alturlie Point.</i>
Addendum Para 7.9	Reference to further update being circulated at the end of June 2024. Was this issued? If yes, please can a copy be provided.	Conslt		<i>No this was not issued due to the Addendum being issued and being available on the HIAL and CAA websites. HIAL awaits the outcome of the ACP</i>

				<i>decision prior to further communication with stakeholders.</i>
Addendum Section 7	Request for evidence of which stakeholders the group email updates were sent to, for example by providing raw data emails or screenshots that show the list of recipients.	Conslt		<i>This has been provided under separate cover.</i>
Addendum Para 9.1	The AIS cut-off date is 22 Nov 24; why do you intend to submit changes no later than 7 Nov 22?	Gen		<i>The ACP Project Team aims to have all documentation submitted 2 weeks before. The additional 2 weeks is for the purpose of any delays or queries that may arise prior to cut-off date.</i>