

NOTES OF CAA MEETING ROUTE 4 – 3rd FEBRUARY 2021

Those present:

CAA	GAL	ANSL/OSPREY
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]		[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]		[REDACTED]

The meeting was requested by GAL following correspondence to the CAA from GAL. The correspondence refers to Gatwick Route 4 Redesign of RNAV SIDs (ACP-2018-86) – Stage 2 Clarification. This letter has been published on the CAA portal ([Link](#)).

GAL seeks clarification from the CAA on 1) The Baseline 2) Environmental Assessment 3) Progress beyond Stage 2.

Notes

- GAL provided a brief review summary of the meeting purpose and status of the ACP following the Stage 2 Gateway held in February 2020.
- A substantial development since the Stage 2 gateway has been the implementation of CAP1912 (the denotification of the 2016 RNAVs on Route 4).
- Traffic patterns post RNAV removal (25th February 2021) will be different to before removal, and modelling may not appropriately reflect these future traffic patterns.

Clarification 1: Baseline

Request for clarification from CAA

1. That the reversion to using conventional navigation on route 4 (implemented 25/02/2021) will be the 'do nothing' and the 'baseline' route. From a regulatory decision perspective, how this route is flown (i.e. track over the ground) will form the basis of the assessment.

CAA response

- CAA explained that in their view, due to COVID-19 impacts, GAL is in a different position now as an airport, compared to when it went through the Gateway this time last year. It is now known that the conventional Route 4 will be the route used for the foreseeable future and in 2 years' time when the CAA come to assess the ACP. Any assessment by the CAA will be carried out against the baseline of the conventional route implemented on 25 Feb 2021, and the CAA understands that aircraft track data can only be collated on this route after this date.
- CAA said that the baseline is the conventional February 2021 route, and any RNAV route proposal will be assessed against this.
- CAA confirmed that it will be the nominal track that they will be assessing against at decision time.
- CAA propose that GAL's do minimum option would be to implement an RNAV1 replication of the conventional route. If this option was used, then para E21 within CAP 1616 becomes critical i.e. clarifying the difference between 'do nothing' and 'do minimum'.
- CAA stated that clarification for communities and describing what used to happen (2013 - 2021) is very welcome, and it is up to GAL to decide how best to achieve this. Providing a sufficient narrative to explain to communities the difference between the

route they are familiar with and recognise (2013-2021 traffic patterns), and the traffic patterns expected after 25/02/2021 as a result of the implementation of CAP1912 (which will be used for the purposes of the assessment), is critical.

- The critical part of this is the engagement and “telling the story” of why Stage 2 of the ACP is starting at this point in February 2021, as well as clarifying data sets and timelines.

Notes

- Do minimum (the re-designed RNAV) is used as the basis for Options Appraisal.
- GAL confirmed with the CAA that the relevant comparator is the conventional route as flown by the airlines (i.e. tracks over the ground) which will differ from the path as design on the chart.
- GAL pointed out that traffic flows may evolve and as such differences may be seen between 1) the conventional route February 2021, and 2) the traffic patterns associated with the route at the point of implementation of this ACP.

Clarification 2: Environmental Assessments

Request for clarification from CAA

1. Is 3 months of data collected following CAP1912 implementation (i.e. the ‘do nothing/do minimum’ option) between Mar - May 2021 sufficient input to ERCD for this work.
2. Are historic data volumes (based on 2019 Gatwick ATMs) representative to give to CAA for environmental assessment.
3. Is there regulatory guidance on the period over which data should be captured and how large this sample should be to enable valid ERCD noise and other environmental metrics assessments (L_{Aeq} , 16 hours contours)?
4. The same question also for the nighttime period (L_{Aeq} , 8 hours contours)?

CAA response

- CAA explained that ERCD is a consultancy within CAA and so would have to divide GAL's question into two parts: 1) to ask ERCD if 3 months of data post 25th February is sufficient for ERCD to complete their environmental assessments and could they use GAL's 2019 traffic data as a representative data set, and 2) GAL's request for regulatory policy guidance on if this data period and data set is acceptable.

Clarification 3: Progress beyond Stage 2

Request for clarification from CAA

- GAL understands that ACP-2018-86 is not subject to CAA pause/re-start guidance, having assessed the guidance published by the CAA (GAL has published a timeline)
- It was discussed and agreed that, in line with the guidance published by the CAA, there is no requirement to update the Route 4 ACP-2018-86 Statement of Need in light of the COVID-19 pandemic.
- GAL assumes the absence of the Airspace Modernisation Masterplan will not constrain progress on the Route 4 ACP in any way.

CAA response

- CAA confirmed that the ACP is not subject to CAA pause/re-start guidance.
- CAA clarified that the airspace modernisation masterplan should not constrain progress on Route 4 if Route 4 does not impact other FASI-S airport's progress. Change sponsors must ensure there are no unintended consequences from their ACPs on other FASI-S airports' ACPs.
- CAA are assessing the policy question of 'typical' traffic volumes, as when recovery happens there will be a new normal. CAA stressed that the answer will not be quick as currently no policy position has yet been established, but one is being developed.

GAL pointed out that some degree of certainty is required before going through another Gateway.

It was stressed that a swift answer from the CAA to questions will be required in order that proposed timelines can be met for proceeding through Stage 2 and beyond.

A summary of questions for the CAA

1. What is considered 'typical' traffic levels post COVID?
2. Is three months of data adequate for assessment from a regulatory point of view?
3. What will happen if DfT intervene on track keeping?

The meeting concluded with CAA taking away some questions for ERCD, as well as confirming they would come back to GAL with the answers to questions posed of the CAA.

Post meeting update: Airspace Regulation advised that GAL would need to contact ERCD directly regarding any noise modelling queries. This is because of an internal decision to keep ERCD independent from Airspace Regulation due to any potential conflict of interest risk. ERCD would be able to provide guidance to GAL as a noise consultant directly.