# Edinburgh Airport: Airspace Change Programme
# Stage 2: Engagement Rationale
ACP-2019-32

**Document control**

| | |
|---|---|
| **ACP reference** | ACP-2019-32 |
| **Version** | V1.2 |
| **Date** | 28/02/23 |
| **Purpose** | CAP1616 Stage 2 Gateway Submission to CAA |
| **Classification** | Confidential |
| **Author** | Edinburgh Airport Limited |

**Edinburgh Airport: Airspace Change Programme**
**Stage 2: Engagement Rationale**
**Version 1.2 Updated**
ACP-2019-32

## Amendments v1.2

| Amendment | Page |
|---|---|
| **Expansion and rewriting of Stakeholder rationale text** | **6** |
| **Signposting** | **9** |

**Content**

**Purpose**

Our Stage 2 Stakeholder Engagement Report was included as part of our CAP1616 ACP Stage 2 submission in early September 2022. The CAA have requested clarification on two points which are;
First, engagement with the same stakeholders as Step 1B (CAP1616 para 125), and second how we have taken decisions in our options that relate to stakeholder feedback. The purpose of this report is to provide clarification on these two points.

**Stage 1 Engagement**

The engagement for Stage 1 of the ACP took place between September and November 2019. A comprehensive engagement strategy was written with independent oversight from the Consultation Institute. Progressive Partnership was contracted to run the engagement sessions on behalf of Edinburgh Airport Limited.

Stage 1 engagement was undertaken to establish design principles in accordance with Stage 1, Step 1B and this gateway was successfully passed in July 2021 with 16 design principles being approved.

Step 1 B's engagement consisted of five workshops, three focus groups and two recall workshops.

The two recall workshops were not a requirement of CAP1616 but were included over and above the process outlined, to enable EDI to check the understanding of stakeholders that the 16 design principles reflected the discussions we had conducted throughout the engagement.

**These workshops, focus groups and recall workshops for Stage 1B engagement are detailed below.**

| | Attendance |
|---|---|
| **5 Engagement Workshops** | |
| **Community: North and West** | **19** |
| **Aviation** | **10** |
| **EANAB** | **6** |
| **General Stakeholder** | **15** |
| **Community: South and East** | **16** |
| **3 Focus Groups** | |
| **Overflown within noise contours** | **11** |
| **Overflown outwith noise contours** | **11** |
| **Not overflown but potentially could be (outlying areas)** | **6** |
| **2 Recall Workshops** | |
| **Community Stakeholders** | **16** |
| **Aviation Stakeholders** | **7** |

It should be noted that the engagement for Stage 1 took place before the Covid pandemic and all engagement was conducted face to face.

**Stage 2 Engagement**

Stage 2 engagement was very detailed introducing a number of ideas for SID options, arrival options and how we would deal with capacity and measuring the responses and discussion against the 16 design principles agreed in Stage 1 and the three main drivers of the Statement of Need. Given the ground to be covered, the engagement for Stage 2 consisted of two full presentations to stakeholders with subsequent questions, discussion and participant inputs, all recorded and codified.

The first presentation discussed high level concepts and introduced the ideas of four SIDs and our arrival options. This was provided on two occasions, giving the opportunity for observations, insights and feedback about the concepts for flightpaths that we introduced.

The second presentation examined our options for arrivals and departures, how we would design for our capacity needs, a description of modernisation and also how our environmental design principles would be applied to our flight paths. Our engagement material covered all of our proposals and there was ample opportunity for participant involvement, enabling extensive feedback. We also created a virtual space which all stakeholders were invited to log in to, so they could see the engagement material in their own time. As a secondary objective, we were testing this for the Stage 3 Public Consultation engagement and its success and encouraging feedback means it is a dialogue channel we are actively considering for Stage 3.

**The attendance at the Stage 2 workshops is detailed below:**

| | **Attendance** |
|---|---|
| **Engagement Presentation 1** | |
| **1st session** | **16** |
| **2nd session** | **22** |
| **Engagement Presentation 2** | |
| **1st session** | **21** |
| **2nd session** | **15** |
| **3rd session** | **11** |

Given the precautions necessitated by the COVID pandemic, all Stage 2 stakeholder engagement took place online with the exception of Engagement presentation two, the third session which was a hybrid meeting taking place on line, and also at the Double Tree Hilton Hotel at the Airport.

This online engagement was a a significant change from Stage 1 engagment and was a factor in the planning and implementation of Stage 2 engagement.

**Stage 2 Engagement**
**Stakeholder Rationale**

Edinburgh Airport values the rich dialogue it has with its communities and understands the value of listening to stakeholders and incorporating their voices into our thinking as we build a plan for modernising and improving our airspace.

It was clear to us at the outset of this ACP process that the different stages required different stakeholders. In Stage 1 we decided to have as many voices as possible advising us in the creation of the design principles that guide the Project and thus had a large number of stakeholders engaged.

When considering Stage 2 and its increased technical content, it was clear to us that this engagement required a smaller group that had a greater understanding of airspace and how it worked. We therefore decided to structure our engagement around communities we'd discussed noise with previously, such as those with representation on the Edinburgh Airport Noise Advisory Board (EANAB). The acceleration of the Airspace Change Masterplan also saw us bring in representatives from more technical stakeholders such as NERL and ANSL.

For this engagement we decided that it was important that geographic areas were represented. For example, Dalgety Bay CC represented the Fife Coast rather than a number of villages. We also decided that we did not require to include areas that were not overflown which also saw some Stage 1 contributors not included.

We believe that this approach which gave us flexibility around a core group of stakeholders allowed us to get the best contribution from our community and technical stakeholders, providing a strong and clear voice that has influenced and guided our thinking.

The attendees in Stages 1 and 2 Engagement sessions were essentially the same, coming from the same pool, but varied given stakeholder turnover, and their choice of differing delegates because of the nature of the discussions what was required of the engagement.

We were careful however, to ensure continuity of communities between Stage 2 and Stage 1 to make sure communities continued to have a strong and rich voice in our considerations. Our community Noise Board, which represents all communities under our flightpaths, remains a key stakeholder.

We hope that our engagement has been a robust and informing process – our thinking is better because of it and we feel lucky to have such engaged stakeholders. Our feedback from them is that process has been valued.

| | EANAB | Community | Aviation | ATC | General |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Stage 1 attendees** | **6** | **35** | **10** | **2** | **15** |
| **Stage 2 attendees** | **8** | **9** | **10** | **13** | **9** |

We planned more ATC representation as we worked through our options with NERL and our local ATC provider ANSL. We also it built in representation from Glasgow ATC and their ACP consultants in light of our shared work on the Scottish TMA Masterplan.

Following the workshops for the Stage 1 ACP engagement where we had several people from each area, we asked community representatives from the North and West (West Lothian and Fife), and also the South and East (Mid and East Lothian) to engage in withn us in our online sessions and provide feedback. Details of attendance are found in the engagement document submitted in Stage 2. Engagement continues with community representatives and is particularly effective, we think, through the EANAB subgroup.

A goal in this period of engagement was to facilitate as much two-way dialogue as possible – the transmitting of detailed information and the capture of feedback, ideas and comment to drive further iterations. One example of this is the local knowledge community representatives provided on planning issues and the location of sensitive areas which we will incorporate as we finalise our flight paths.

This is a thread that stretches back to Stage 1 Engagement as we listened, engaged, refocused our ideas and thought about which options would work for us and our stakeholders in the implementation of the ACP itself. Our technical workstream loked at including viable options in the form of swathes which were included in the Sateg 2 engagement sessions, and we had generally positive feedback although there was a lot of detailed material to absorb and give feedback on.

We continue to engage with numerous stakeholders as we move forward with the project. These people include EANAB, the EACC, local developers, politicians and Transport Scotland. We also speak to NERL, ANSL, the airlines, local airspace users and our ATC inspectorate on a regular basis. The attendance records for or engagement sessions are included in this document at Annex B.

**CAP 1616 compliance**

**Stage 2**

We note that the CAA requires clarity on our thinking on our approach to engagement in each stage.

Step 2A requires the change sponsor to develop a first comprehensive list of options that addresses the SoN and align with the design principles from Stage 1. We understood that we were required to test these with the same stakeholders we engaged with in step 1B to ensure that our stakeholders are satisfied that the design options are aligned with the design principles and that the change sponsor has properly understood and accounted for stakeholder concerns specifically related to the design options.

As detailed above, our approach was to blend stakeholders from the same group determined on the discussion and augment where necessary to facilitate the best discussion. We continue to engage with stakeholders through various forums, including EANAB, the EACC, FLOPSC meetings, and bespoke workshops for the CAP1616 process and indeed a variety of issues including sustainability, noise and airport projects.

This approach has been to try to ensure that all community areas under our existing flightpaths are represented through the noise board (EANAB) and that they have their views considered. We have also engaged continmually with NERL and ANSL to make sure our design progresses in the appropriate manner.

There are numerous examples of this detailed in the engagement submission. These include input from the MoD not to overfly their Kirknewton Glider Centre when active, so we included options to route around that area. Another example is the broad consensus from our communities asking for a route along the Firth of Forth, or indeed routing more aircraft over water and there are options to allow this being taken forward. Another example is the straightening the GRICE SID from Rwy06 to reduce track miles after engagement with NERL. We have also included any requirements for additional controlled airspace which met with a mixed response from our stakeholders.

An engagement strategy was developed as recommended in Appendix C of the CAP 1616 and para C27 states:

“Bilateral meetings and smaller challenge groups are likely to be sufficient to ensure that stakeholder concerns have been properly understood and accounted for in designing options.”

As mentioned previously we conducted two rounds of engagement sessions with our stakeholders and many other meetings have been held with both internal and external stakeholders. The attendees are included in the engagement submission. These are detailed below and we have added greatly to our thinking and consideration, providing updates, advice or ideas to incorporate into our options.

This has all assisted in the development of options that we believe achieve our SoN drivers including capacity, modernisation and an environmental improvement.

A list of these meetings as well as our engagement sessions up to the end of July 2022 is included at Annex A.

**Conclusion**

The purpose of this document was to explain our approach and provide detail on our engagement process, describing its compliance with the requirements of CAP 1616. We have described our engagement sessions, attendees and feedback with the majority of information to be found in our engagement submission. We

hope that this document read alongside the more detailed account in our Stage 2 engagement submission document clarifies how we have engaged with the same stakeholders in Stage 2 as in Stage 1B. Our engagement provided a robust and lively discussion with feedback enriching our design options as shown in Annec C of this document and in further detail in engagement document submitted in September 2022.

**Signposting**

On the initial submission of our Stage 2 documentation on September 2nd 2022 this email was distributed to our stakeholders:

" Good afternoon,

This email is to inform you that we have submitted our documentation for Stage 2 of our Airspace Change Process. The documentation is available to read on the CAA's ACP Portal here and we should learn whether we have passed through the Stage 2 gateway in four weeks' time (September 30th).
Thank you to all for any contribution so far.

We still have a lot of work to do with the full options appraisal and preparation of consultation material at the beginning of Stage 3.
Our public consultation will probably be in Q4 next year. "

On completion of the current amendments and updates with a further submission imminent, a similar email will be sent to our stakeholders informing them of where to find the documentation, with a link included, and also an invitation to contact us with any questions. Engagement continues with our stakeholders and regular updates have and will be given throughout the coming months as we work towards our public consultation which is now provisionally in early 2024.

"

**Annex A**

A list of on-line meetings and engagement sessions.

## Engagement Record Stage 2

| Date | Stakeholder | Duration | Purpose |
|---|---|---|---|
| 5 May 2021 | EANAB | 2 hours | Stage 1 and 2 ACP update |
| 28 May 2021 | ACOG | 1 hour | EDI ACP Funding |
| 2 June 2021 | EANAB | 2 hours | Stage 1 and 2 update |
| 10 June 2021 | ACOG | 1.5 hours | ScTMA Deployment programme |
| 11 June 2021 | ANSL | 1 hour | ACP catch up |
| 16 June 2021 | EDI / NERL | 1 hour | Structure briefing |
| 16 June 2021 | ACOG | 2 hours | Masterplan briefing |
| 6 July 2021 | ANSL | 0.5 hours | Catch up |
| 12 July 2021 | FLOPSC | 2 Hours | ACP update |
| 13 July 2021 | ACOG | 1 hour | Stage 2 and 3 design process |
| 15 July 2021 | NATS | 2 hours | ICAMS #8 |
| 20 July 2021 | ACOG | 2 hours | Stage 2 and 3 design process |
| 21 July 2021 | AOA | 2 hours | AATS working group |
| 27 July 2021 | GLA | 1 hour | Catch up |
| 29 July 2021 | ACOG | 1 hour | Masterplan development |
| 29 July 2021 | ANSL | 1 hour | ACP workshop |
| 4 August 2021 | EANAB | 2 hours | ACP update |
| 9 August 2021 | ScTMA group | 1.5 hours | ACP Planning |
| 10 August 2021 | ScTMA group | 4 hours | Options workshop |
| 12 August 2021 | EANAB Aviation SG | 1.5 hours | ACP Update |
| 6 September 2021 | EDI/GLA | 2 hours | GA briefing coordination |
| 8 September 2021 | ACOG + ScTMA group | 4 hours | Sim and safety planning session |
| 9 September 2021 | EDI/GLA | 2.5 hours | GA briefing |
| 13 September 2021 | FLOPSC | 2 hours | ACP Update |
| 20 September 2021 | ACOG/EDI | 0.5 hours | Masterplan Development |
| 22 September 2021 | EDI/ANSL | 6 hours | Design workshop |
| 23 September 2021 | ACOG | 0.5 hours | Design principles and sim alignment |
| 27 September 2021 | CAA | 2 hours | External Stakeholder CAP1616 review workshop #3 |
| 28 September 2021 | ScTMA group | 6 hours | NERL workshop 1 ScTMA redesign |
| 29 September 2021 | EANAB Aviation SG | 1 hour | ACP update |
| 30 September 2021 | ScTMA group | 6 hours | NERL workshop 2 ScTMA redesign |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 01 October 2021 | ScTMA group | 6 hours | NERL workshop 3 ScTMA redesign |
| 05 October 2021 | ScTMA group + ACOG | 4 hours | Detailed planning session |
| 06 October 2021 | EANAB | 2 hours | ACP catch up |
| 11 October 2021 | ACOG | 1 hour | Cumulative Impact |
| 18 October 2021 | WSP | 1 hour | Virtual Engagement |
| 21 October 2021 | EANAB Aviation SG | 1.5 hours | ACP update |
| 22 October 2021 | NATS | 3 hours | ICAMS #9 |
| 29 October 2021 | WSP | 0.5 hours | Virtual engagement |
| 2 November 2021 | NERL | 2 hours | Point Merge |
| 3 November 2021 | NERL | 0.5 hours | Reduced departure distance |
| 5 November 2021 | EDI/GLA/ACOG | 3 hours | Show and tell options |
| 8 November 2021 | FLOPSC | 2 hours | ACP update |
| 9 November 2021 | ACOG | 1.5hours | Baseline year for SCTMA |
| 11 November 2021 | AOA | 2 hours | AATS WG |
| 15 November 2021 | ACOG | 1 hour | EDI Baseline and options |
| 17 November 2021 | NERL | 6 hours | Long list options |
| 1 December 2021 | EANAB | 2 hours | ACP catch up |
| 6 December 2021 | GLA/NERL | 2 hours | Point merge discussion |
| 10 December 2021 | NERL | 1 hour | BGA engagement planning |
| 16 December 2021 | EANAB SG | 1.5 hours | ACP Update |
| 17 December 2021 | Airlines | 1 hour | EDI Airspace |
| 5 January 2022 | NERL | 1 hour | EDI requirements |
| 5 January 2022 | EANAB | 2 hours | ACP catch up |
| 6 January 2022 | Airlines | 0.5 hours | Requirements |
| 10 January 2022 | FLOPSC - NERL | 2 hours | ACP catch up |
| 14 January 2022 | CAA | 1 hour | ACP update |
| 17 January 2022 | NERL | 0.5 hours | BGA engagement prep |
| 18 January 2022 | ScTMA group + ACOG | 1.5 hours | Coordination meeting |
| 21 January 2022 | ACOG | 0.5 hours | Catch up |
| 28 January 2022 | NERL | 1 hour | Vis sim playback |
| 4 February 2022 | NERL + ANS | 2 hours | Vis sim playback |
| 4 February 2022 | NERL | 0.5 hours | BGA engagement |
| 7 February 2022 | NERL | 1.5 hours | Vis sim review |
| 8 February 2022 | NERL – BGA | 1.5 hours | Engagement |
| 10 February 2022 | NATS | ICAMS #10 | Meeting |
| 14 February 2022 | EANAB SG | 1.5 hours | ACP Catch up |
| 18 February 2022 | CAA | 1 hour | Stage 2 briefing |
| 23 February 2022 | Stakeholder engagement session. See engagement document for attendees | 2 hours | Engagement |
| 23 February 2022 | NERL | 0.5 hours | EDI requirements |
| 1 March 2022 | Stakeholder engagement session. See engagement | 2 hours | Engagement |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | document for attendees | | |
| 2 March 2022 | Cramond | 1 hour | Briefing |
| 2 March 2022 | ANSL | 1.5 hours | ACP catch up |
| 14 March 2022 | FLOPSC | 2 hours | ACP Update |
| 15 March 2022 | ScTMA group + ACOG | 1.5 hours | Coordination group |
| 16 March 2022 | NERL | 1 hour | Time bound SIDs |
| 21 March 2022 | EANAB SG | 1.5 hours | ACP catch up |
| 22 March 2022 | ACOG | 0.5 hours | Lessons learned |
| 25 March 2022 | ACOG | 2 hours | Stage 2 update |
| 6 April 2022 | To70 | 6 hours | Workshop |
| 7 April 2022 | To70 | 6 hours | Workshop |
| 8 April 2022 | ACOG | 0.5 hours | Options discussion |
| 8 April 2022 | ScTMA ACOG | 1 hour | Stage 3 planning |
| 29 April 2022 | EANAB SG | 1.5 hours | ACP catch up |
| 3 May 2022 | NERL ScTMA | 1 hour | Catch up |
| 4 May 2022 | NERL ScTMA | 0.5 hours | Catch up |
| 11 May 2022 | ScTMA group + ACOG | 1.5 hours | Coordination group |
| 12 May 2022 | ANSL | 3 hours weekly | Liaison |
| 17 May 2022 | NERL | 1 hour | Ops and Dev sim |
| 19 May 2022 | ACOG | 1 hour | Stage 3 planning update |
| 20 May 2022 | EANAB SG | 1.5 hours | ACP catch up |
| 24 May 2022 | Stakeholder engagement session. See engagement document for attendees | 2 hours | Engagement |
| 30 May 2022 | Stakeholder engagement session. See engagement document for attendees | 2 hours | Engagement |
| 31 May 2022 | ICAMS #11 | 3 hours | Meeting |
| 8 June 2022 | ANSL | 1 hour | Governance meeting |
| 9 June 2022 | Stakeholder engagement session. See engagement document for attendees | 2 hours | Engagement |
| 13 June 2022 | NERL | 0.5 hours | Catch up |
| 14 June 2022 | Politicians | 1 hour | ACP Update |
| 16 June 2022 | Transport Scotland | 1 hour | ACP update |
| 22 June 2022 | CAA | 1 hour | Departure separations |
| 24 June 2022 | Cramond | 1 hour | Possible solution |
| 27 June 2022 | EAL ANSL workshop | 6 hours | Option possibilities |
| 6 July 2022 | EANAB | 2 hours | Monthly update |
| 8 July 2022 | EANAB SG | 2 hours | ACP catch up |
| 11 July 2022 | FLOPSC | 2 hours | ACP update |
| 13 July 2022 | ANSL Governance | 1 hour | ACP update |

**Annex B**

**Attendees of Official Engagement Sessions.**

Engagement session 1. Presentation 1

23rd February 2022

| Name | Company/Representing |
|---|---|
| | Attending on behalf of Cumbernauld Airport |
| | MOD |
| | Traxinternational |
| | BUTA |
| | HIAL |
| | NATS |
| | HIAL |
| | LAA |
| | systemwise |
| | airspace4all |
| | AGS airports |
| | EANAB |
| | EANAB |
| | Scottish hang gliding and paragliding |
| | EANAB |
| | EANAB |

Engagement Session 2. Presentation 1

1st March 2022

| Name | Company/Representing |
|---|---|
| | Traxinternational |
| | ppca |
| | ep-scotland |
| | Burntisland community council |
| | EACC |
| | Glasgow Prestwick |
| | Glasgow Prestwick |
| | NATS |
| | HIAL |
| | Ryanair |
| | Consultation Institute |
| | Consultation Institute |
| | anderson strathern |
| | LAA |
| | systemwise |
| | airspace4all |
| | JET2 |
| | Fife Strut |
| | EANAB |
| | GATCO |
| | MOD |

Engagement Session 1. Presentation 2

24th May 2022

| Name | Company/Representing |
|---|---|
| | Prestwick |
| | NATS |
| | NATS |
| | NATS |
| | NATS |
| | NATS |
| | Edinburgh Airport |
| | WSP |
| | British Gliding Association |
| | EANAB |
| | EANAB |
| | Fife Council Environmental Health Officer |
| | -Burntisland community council |
| | EACC |
| | Sestran EACC |
| | EACC |
| | -WFS |
| | British Airways |
| | -Trax GLA ACP |
| | -Trax GLA ACP |
| | -GASCO |
| | Scottish Gliding Centre |
| | Winchburgh Developments |

Engagement Session 2. Presentation 2

30th May 2022

| Name | Company/Representing |
|---|---|
| | EAL |
| | SRUC |
| | NATS |
| | To70 |
| | Attending on behalf of Cumbernauld Airport |
| | MOD |
| | GATCO |
| | GASCO |
| | ARPAS |
| | SRUC Oatridge campus |
| | Scottish hang gliding and paragliding |
| | EACC |
| | -NATS |
| | LAA |

Engagement Session 3. Presentation 2

9th June 2022

This was the only session conducted as a hybrid event

| Name | Company/Representing |
|---|---|
| | EAL |
| | Trax Glasgow ACP |
| | NATS |
| | ANSL |
| | ANSL |
| | WSP |
| | MOD AIRSPACE |
| | GATCO |
| | EANAB |
| | EANAB |
| | EANAB |
| | EANAB |
| | EANAB |
| | Fife Strut |
| | EANAB |
| | NATS |
| | EANAB |

A list of the abbreviations relating to attendees:

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| EANAB | Edinburgh Airport Noise Advisory Board | LAA | Light Aircraft Association |
| NATS | National Air Traffic Sevices | SRUC | Scotland's Rural College |
| WSP | WSP environmental consultants | PPCA | Town Planning Consultancy |
| GATCO | Guild of Air traffic Control Officers | | |
| GASCO | General Aviation Safety Council | | |
| EACC | Edinburgh Airport Concultative Committee | | |
| WFS | World Freight Services | | |
| HIAL | Highlands and Islands Airports Limited | | |

**Annex C**

Our engagement sessions took place in the first half of 2022 with transcripts and stakeholder comment detailed in the engagement documentation submitted on September 2nd 2022. This annex contains a summary of feedback where it has affected our options and the decisions we have taken in relation to this stakeholder feedback (CAP1616 Para C28) . The feedback and influence on our options can be found in more detail in our engagement document submitted in September 2022. Page 88 through to page 125.

**Decisions taken in relation to stakeholder feedback**

| Stakeholder | Issue / Option | EAL ACP response |
|---|---|---|
| Light Aircraft Association | **The volume of CAS. Working with Glasgow airport on designs and containment buffers.** | The final design would look to be wholly contained inside the current CAS volume but we may need CAS to the north to enable better designed GRICE SID and also systmisation for arrivals to Rwy24. We work with Glasgow airport as part of the Scottish cluster and will look at the required volumes of CAS with respect to the buffer zone between the airports and also the previous requirement for Edinburgh's cross runway. Subject to the design's safety we will look to reduce the airspace needed for SIDs, vectoring and arrivals. |
| Flight Ops Safety Committee | **Increased systemisation to allow for better fuel planning and a reduction of emissions.** | The options we are taking forward should allow for continuous climb operations with SIDs to a FL. Also we will systemise arrivals to allow for better planning with the option for vectoring also being taken forward. Airlines are interested in any improvements to track miles and we are looking at the Firth of forth option as well as better connectivity to the south east (in conjunction with NERL). |
| EANAB subgroup | **Noise, health concerns, air quality and the effect of the design principles.** | There is continuous engagement with the EANAB sub group and EANAB itself. Their concerns are expressed through health, air aquality, overflight of sensitive areas and specifically noise. As our options are swathes we can carry oput analysis to route the eventual flight paths around population centres and will explain the process further as the design nears completion in Stage 3. We have indicated that our preference is for four SIDs with a new one routing along the Firth of Forth and this meets with EANAB's approval. We also need to be aware of population centre on the south coast of Fife and will route our flight paths accordingly. The design is also developed using software to highlight sensitive areas such as hospitls and school and the flightpaths contained in the swathes will also be designed with analysis of these areas including areas of tranquility including the Pentland hills and country parks. |
| Cramond residents | **Arrivals and Departures overflying Cramond** | We are engaging with the Cramond residents on a regular basis in order to keep them informed of our ideas. We cannot move the flight path of arrivals to Rwy24 but we believe we can |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | improve the situation for departures from Rwy06 with a turn at altitude moving the flightpath to the north west (a little) and improving the situation with less people being overflown at lower levels Our design will include the safest and tightest left turn under the PRNAV system to establish this improvement. |
| Transport Scotland | **ACP Progress** | Our engagement with Transport Scotland was to inform them of the ACP's progress and the next stages of development. They were very interested in the project and would like to keep informed of developments as we progress. |
| Kirknewton / MOD | **Continuing to glide as detailed in the Letter of Agreement.** | Edinburgh Airport has numerous options of SIDs as our design throughout Stage 2 has swathes within which flight paths will be established. These SIDs to TALLA would need to be assessed against the basline option. Our maximum forecast departure capacity can be reached without an early left turn so assuming we have the ability to reduce our departure interval. This would mean opur fin al flightpath option would be routed around Kirknewton and their gliding could continue as it does today. |
| GATCO | **Liaison with local ATC. (ANSL)** | The GATCO rep made the points that it was highly desirable to avoid conflict between 1) arrival and departure routes, 2) other unit's procedures and 3) areas of aerial activity. We have options that allow for the conflict of departure and arrival routes to be designed out of the system and we also work with Glasgow airport and NERL as part of the masterplan to devise the best design for our own airlines and othjer airspace users. |
| Ecclesmachan and 3 mile town community council | **Noise from overflights, the process and the Firth of Forth. Also departure profies** | Concern was expressed about early turns for departures from Rwy 24 and how they would affect current and future populations. Our options include early turns but with capacity being met by reducing departure intervals between aircraft, early turns should not be required. Also we are working on an NADP project to minimise noise on departure but this is outwith the ACP. |
| EANAB | **All design principles** | We communicate with EANAB on a regular basis and they continue to be updated on the progress of the ACP.Their comments during the official engagement sessions included our ideas for respite, use of the Firth of Forth and whether we needed SIDs to the East from Rwy24. We are continuing with our pursuit of the Firth of Forth SID and arrival route because of fuel savings and the reduction of the number of people overflown and therefore a reduction in noise issues. We cannot have SIDs that are not paired because of convention and human factors issues so we will have SIDs from each runway to the same exit points. Also because the FoF route has a fule saving we need to have this for both runway directions to feel the full benefit. We are looking at respite and believe we can achieve this through restricting SID use through the night. Also we are looking at dispersal and concentration which we can achieve through vectoring arrivals as well as introducing systemisation to arrivals. Departures will continue to be concentrated as we try to achieve continuous climb operations to the maximum level. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| SRUC | **Use of the Forth of Forth, M8 and overflights of sensitive sites / areas** | Concern was expressed about overflight of colleges and schools. This will be addressed early in Stage 3 of the process when we look at an analysis of where the flightpaths are likely to go against design criteria derived from the design principles. It was difficult at this stage to consider some of the Design Principles against flight paths until they we narrowed down to particular a weighting including schools and colleges. We continue to look at flightpaths over the Forth of Forth and the M8 corridoor. |
| Fife council | **Limiting overflights of the south coast of Fife and population centres located there** | Fife council made the comment that we should limit overflying the south coast of Fife as much as possible. We are looking at options in our swathes that route the current GOSAM SID further north to coast in between Dagety Bay and Aberdour, turning left at an appropriate time, and possibly overflying road corridoors. We are well aware of the overflights of inverkeithing and Dalgety bay and will design any SIDs to avoid overflying them below 7000ft as much as possible. |
| Blackness rep (EANAB ) | **Noise issues and overflights** | The individual fromm EANAB and the Blackness area expressed concern about the process and how we would distribute traffic tio reduce noise from departures and overflights. In the departure options we have there will be an analysis of data and flightpaths chosen that minimise population overflown. We will also look at traffic levels and cumulative impact in our design decisions and make sure we justify analytically the options chosen (in Stage 3). Rspite is being looked through the selective use of SIDs during the night. The AMS looks at the concentration of flightpaths and we will also look at dispersal which could be more achievable with arrivals. |
| Cumbernauld airfield | **The impact on the operation of aircraft at Cumbernauld airfield.** | Cumbernauld commented that because the design was currently in development it would be difficult to form an opinion. They thought the way forward was clear in the process and looked forward to futher engagement. As Cumbernauld airport is situated below CAS and is some distance from Edinburgh Airport any concerns they may have with the future design should be able to be rectified although their runway alignment makes a conflict unlikely. |
| Prestwick Airport | **Complications of airspace design** | Prestwick Airport envisaged no issues from the Edinburgh ACP. They did mention for later in the process that the truncation of SIDs may cause defferent termination points or link routes dependant on the runway in use. This causes some confusion and they would advise against it as it increases communication between pilots and ATC. There are no plans to design truncated routes at Edinburgh but we will be mindful of increasing workload with any design we finalise. |
| Wynchburgh Estates | **Overflights of Wynchburgh** | Wynchburgh commented that they are a strategic core development area and brought our attention the the ACP driver to minimise environmental impact by minimising the number of people overflown and cutting CO2 emissions. In our design we would probably rule out an early right turn from Rwy24 which would overfly Wynchburgh and we have to be mindful of any future developments when we analyse our possible flightpaths. We would therefore, probably look to avoid the area as it is close to the airport and overflights would be a lower levels. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Glasgow Airport | **Interaction of routes for both airports** | Glasgow had no concerns over the engagement or designs and looked forward to working with us as part of the AMS. We are now undertaking work with Glasgow and NERL which is overseen by ACOG in the Cumulative Analysis framework (CAF). This looks at the interactions between the two airports and decides on any possible compromise for routes with safety and environmental concerns as a priority. |
| NERL (NATS en-route limited ) | **The system design with NERL, Glasgow and Edinburgh** | NERL have participate in engagement sessions, workshops and meetings with contributions to the system design and experienced comment. We continue to work with NERL to produce the best solution to our rerquirements of the Firth of Forth, systemisation and PBN SIDs and Approach transitions. They have also contributed to our preferred optiopns of working towards a FoF solution that will reduce aircraft noise for residents and also reduce emissions and allow respite. We participate in simulator sessions and workshops to enhance design ideas and look at safety assurance of the design.Our options will be modified to produce the best solution for Edinburgh Airport and the system above us, which includes the CAF work for dependencies. |
| Air Navigation Solutions Limited (ANSL) Edinburgh Airport's Air Traffic Control service provider | **The system design, systemisation, achieving capacity and safety.** | ANSL are continuously involved in the EAL ACP. They attend regular workshops and meetings as well as providing resource for simulator sessions and safety workshops. From the outset they have had an input into the progression of our design and were also present at our engagement sessions. Their preference for arrivals systemisation with the use of vectors when required has been kept and taken through as an arrival option. They also looked to how we would increase runway throughput and capacity which we can now achieve through reducing our departure interval. ANSL are supportive of this and back us to deliver a modern systemised airspace with simplicity and functionality at its core. There will be future opportunity for simulator sessions to test designs as well as the construction of a traning plan and safety assurance document before implementation. |