

**SID ACP
Framework Briefing
1100, 11th August 2014
CAA House**

Attendees

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Apologies

[REDACTED]

This Framework Briefing was designed to be an addendum to the framework Briefing which was held in Feb 2013, prior to the SIDs and STARs design / implementation being delayed to integrate with LAMP. The aim was to provide an update and discuss the ACP associated with SIDs / STARs.

[REDACTED] gave a brief introduction to the LSA situation.

[REDACTED] Powerpoint Presentation

Discussion Points

[REDACTED] Double AIRAC cycle is an 83 day process – will need to submit by Apr 15 to meet Dec 15 implementation

24 Southerly SID will terminate at ENIRI and join the new proposed airway being developed as part of LAMP which continues to HAPPY. Will LSA be required to consult between ENIRI – HAPPY? NATS have already consulted but at the levels LCY traffic will be using. SEN expect traffic to be flying higher than the published levels. CAA to reply back to SEN on this.

A SID travelling through a danger area can be called a SID.

SEN advised by the CAA to detail the rationale for each of the considered option for SIDs and why a particular option is favoured and the others have been discounted. (advantages v disadvantages)
If no change, portray the no change option too.

█ advised not obliged to do head counts for noise abatement procedure swathes, though population counts are still required for any Leq contours and SEL footprints.

SEN should describe the % increase of traffic over an area i.e what you can expect to see in the future. Should detail typical heights / typical types of a/c and the associated noise levels.

Respite – gaps in the day / operation could be considered as respite.

Noise Abatement Procedures – given new procedures will use RNAV technology can portray the track as a swathe (1km either side of the track) up to a distance and height

Need consideration for new people overflown – CLN SID – noise benefit / how concentrated / noise impact. Turns in the procedures create dispersion.

Be careful of saying there is benefit if it is unlikely

Consider overlaying

- Actual dispersions
- Potential designs
- Potential dispersions

Useful to indicate number of flights either per day or per hour that can be expected.

In terms of projections 5 years ahead is sufficient.

Full public Consultation or Consultation through the ACC and details available on the website – █ to revert to SEN.

█ Suggested we perhaps email all affected Councils with direction to the web-site page.

Any population that will be overflown regularly should be informed of the consultation

Noise assessments should include LEQ contours and SEL footprints and should detail the current situation. █ confirmed SEN can use the 2012 contours as they are the most recent unless Summer 14 are ready by the time SEN goes out to consult. (detail increase in traffic since 2012)

SEN to send CAA a copy of the presentation containing relevant the questions. Post meeting note – complete.

█ talked through some design options which replicate much the same track that the PDR's follow today, █ – █ advised discussing with █ before progressing down this route.

SEN were advised to take note of new Air Navigation Guidance that was published this year.