

Graham Stocks

From: Graham Stocks [graham_stocks@ntlworld.com]
Sent: 01 July 2004 15:37
To: GBLCH@aol.com
Subject: FW: NEMA Airspace Change Proposal



Environmental
factsheet 14 .pd...

-----Original Message-----

From: Butcher David [mailto:David.Butcher@dap.caa.co.uk]
Sent: 01 July 2004 15:05
To: 'Graham Stocks'
Subject: RE: NEMA Airspace Change Proposal

Dear Mr Stocks,

DAVENTRY 2 is a departure route; inbound procedures consist of Standard Terminal Arrival Routes (STARs), which terminate at Holds. It is not possible to show on maps where aircraft will be flying precisely, particularly after they leave a Hold to go to final approach to the runway concerned, or when they reach an altitude on a departure route that enables them to be vectored by an air traffic controller. This latter altitude is normally approximately 3,000 feet, depending on the aerodrome concerned. Controllers may require to take aircraft off the designated departure route for the purpose of integrating them safely into the prevailing traffic flows. If there is no requirement to instruct an aircraft to depart the route in this way, it will proceed in accordance with its 'flight plan' to the end of the route or next turning point, in this case the Brookmans Park Beacon.

It is important to understand, therefore, that routes in controlled airspace are published as a template for flight planning purposes. However, air traffic controllers may use the full lateral and vertical extent of available controlled airspace according to the prevailing operational circumstances. On that basis, aircraft will be seen or heard at various places and at different altitudes depending on such factors as the amount of traffic, the landing and take-off direction at airports, and the weather.

In other words, air traffic controllers are able to make tactical judgements about the way in which they will position aircraft in controlled airspace; the precise positioning of aircraft will change by the minute, hour and day. For example, it may not be necessary in certain circumstances to place aircraft into a Holding Pattern, even though the initial part of the inbound procedure, as published for flight planning purposes, assumes otherwise. In those circumstances, controllers would turn the aircraft off the planned route to the Hold and instead take the aircraft on a more direct track,

perhaps to the relevant final approach point to the runway in use, but in any event safely separating that aircraft from others in the landing sequence, as required; everything depends on the circumstances at the time. In addition to being safe, air traffic controllers are required to be expeditious. That said, it is more likely that, during the day when it is busy, aircraft will fly the published inbound procedures.

Overall, I hope that the foregoing has explained how controlled airspace is operated. I suggest that your questions about DAVENTRY 2 and other aspects of the airspace change proposal should have been directed to NEMA as the change sponsor; ideally, this should have been done during the period of the initial consultation, perhaps through the Independent Consultative Committee, but could have been done at any time, consultation being a two-way process. It would certainly be better than reliance on newspaper reports, which in my experience are sometimes ill-informed, incomplete or inaccurate. Sorry to be so blunt but it is up to consultees to communicate with those who consult with them to the extent that they consider appropriate.

For example, such communication would have dealt with any misunderstanding about 'fuel jettison areas', but I hope that the attached Environmental Information Sheet (Fuel Dumping and Contrails) will be of help.

Yours sincerely,

David Butcher
Consultation Secretary
Directorate of Airspace Policy

-----Original Message-----

From: Graham Stocks [mailto:graham_stocks@ntlworld.com]

Sent: 24 June 2004 16:22

To: Butcher David

Subject: RE: NEMA Airspace Change Proposal

Importance: High

Dear Mr. Butcher,

When we were informed of the proposed airspace changes in 2002 we learned about DAVENTRY 2. Nothing was said or indicated that the return flow from the south would be over the eastern half of the county - it was therefore assumed that the status quo would be maintained via SAPCO. There is so much that we have not been informed about as to make our comments, as a process of consultation, meaningless. No maps showing exactly where aircraft will be flying, or the holding stacks, have been published in our local county newspaper. All the newspaper has

published, to my knowledge, is a graphic illustrating DAVENTRY 2. This is very unsatisfactory. Details regarding fuel jettison areas, for example, ought to be publicly acknowledged. This is a fairly rare event, though NEMA does take quite a few diversions when weather elsewhere is poor and no doubt a number of a/c arrive slightly above their MLW and need to dump. We simply do not have, or ever have had, the full picture.

Yours sincerely,
Graham Stocks,
Chairman, Leics. CPRE.

-----Original Message-----

From: Butcher David [mailto:David.Butcher@dap.caa.co.uk]
Sent: 21 June 2004 11:21
To: 'Graham Stocks'
Subject: RE: NEMA Airspace Change Proposal

Dear Mr Stocks,

The NEMA proposal was sent out in a letter dated 19 September 2002. Our records show that you responded with an undated letter sent either later that month or in early October 2002. In fact, you sent an e-mail on 10 October 2002 to ask for confirmation that the Airport had received your letter as you were concerned because you had not received an acknowledgement.

Your letter posed 7 questions and, amongst other things, asked for information about flights to particular destinations that you listed in a table. The reply you were sent from NEMA (Neil Robinson, I think) was dated 3 December 2002; the letter included an apology for responding late.

I hope that this helps.

Yours sincerely,

David Butcher
Consultation Secretary
Directorate of Airspace Policy
0207 453 6524

-----Original Message-----

From: Graham Stocks [mailto:graham_stocks@ntlworld.com]
Sent: 19 June 2004 16:40
To: Butcher David
Subject: RE: NEMA Airspace Change Proposal
Importance: High

Dear Mr. Butcher,

The statement in your letter below (fifth paragraph) that CPRE had been consulted has troubled me for some time. Members of the Nottingham East Midland Airport's Independent Consultative Committee were certainly told of the proposal, though I cannot recall being invited to comment on a formal consultative basis, neither can I locate any documentary evidence to confirm this. I have asked both of my CPRE colleagues who represent their respective counties on NEMA's ICC (Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire) if they can provide any evidence to support the view that a process of consultation had taken place via the airport's ICC for NGOs and other community stakeholders. There appears to be no evidence of this having taken place. Can you therefore please let us know the basis for your assertion that we had been in fact consulted? If I am mistaken please accept my apology.

Yours sincerely,
Graham Stocks,
Leics. CPRE Branch.

-----Original Message-----

From: Butcher David [mailto:David.Butcher@dap.caa.co.uk]
Sent: 21 April 2004 14:40
To: 'graham_stocks@ntworld.com'
Subject: NEMA Airspace Change Proposal

Dear Mr Stocks,

Mr Arscott, Director of Airspace Policy, has asked me to thank you for your letter of 10 April regarding the title subject and for your e-mail of the 19th that posed an additional question. He has requested me to respond on his behalf to both communications in my role as Consultation Secretary.

In response to your letter, it is apparent that the questions relate to operational factors. However, the purpose of any initial consultation on an airspace change proposal is to address, mainly, issues concerning any environmental impact on the local communities affected by the proposed change. Then, it would be for the DAP, when analysing a change proposal, to ensure that, amongst many other things, the initial consultation had been completed satisfactorily. We would also be required to examine the operational aspects, as covered by questions 1 to 6 inclusive, in accordance with our responsibilities as the airspace approval and regulatory authority and in the context of the Directions given to us by the Secretary of State - you will recall that these are listed in the Environmental Guidance that has also been provided to us by the SoS under Section 70 of the Transport Act 2000.

In respect of question 7, it would not be appropriate to comment on any restrictions that may be placed on new departure or arrival routes since operational constraints, if any, have yet to be determined. In summary, we cannot provide you with the answers to questions 1 to 7 because they concern

operational considerations that are technical in nature and are for us to deal with. Furthermore, they are outside the intended purpose of the initial consultation that the CPRE has already participated in.

As regards question 8, controlled airspace is made available for all users. The latter would of course include the main users such as those aircraft that, in accordance with the proposal, would fly on the routes that have been designed to accommodate arriving and departing aircraft operating at the Airport. In addition, any transit aircraft requiring to overfly the area would be accommodated in the airspace subject to appropriate instructions from air traffic control. This is the same situation that applies throughout the UK airspace structure and is based entirely on the operational requirements of aircraft operators for the safe and efficient conduct of flight. For their part, air traffic controllers can use the entirety of controlled airspace available to them according to the prevailing operational circumstances and to meet the requirement to safely separate and sequence aircraft in the various phases of flight. That is why aircraft will fly in controlled airspace at places other than just on the designated arrival and departure routes. As regards question 9, I recommend that you ask NEMA if you can inspect its formal airspace change proposal. In that respect it is worth noting that an airspace change proposer 'owns' the proposal throughout administration of the airspace change process.

Turning now to your e-mail, you have pointed out that the CPRE is a member of the NEMA Independent Consultative Forum and the proposal document indicates that the CPRE has been consulted accordingly. Records also show that the NEMA consultation with affected local communities commenced on 19 September 2002. It would have terminated in September 2003 when the proposal was produced in final form for subsequent submission to DAP. In the event that DAP initiated Formal Consultation, we would consult with the representative organisations of the National Air Traffic Management Advisory Committee; as you know, CPRE is not a member organisation. In this particular case we have exceptionally agreed to consult with Leicestershire County Council, Harborough District Council and Melton Borough Council. Although, from our perspective, CPRE has already been consulted by NEMA through the ICF during the initial consultation phase, there is of course nothing to stop you now passing your comments to any of those councils.

Finally, the proposal continues to be considered in accordance with the Airspace Change Process. In your letter you cite your acquaintance with CAP 725, Guidance on the Airspace Change Process but, if you have not already done so, you may also wish to examine the Airspace Change Process itself. This is at Annex F of the Airspace Charter, CAP 724, which can be viewed at: <http://www.caa.co.uk/docs/33/CAP724.pdf>

Yours sincerely,

David Butcher
Consultation Secretary
Directorate of Airspace Policy
0207 453 6524

**This e-mail, and any files transmitted with it, are confidential.
If you are not the intended recipient, please notify our Help Desk
(e-mail: internet.postmaster@srg.caa.co.uk or phone: +44-1293-573333)
immediately.
You should not copy or use this e-mail or attachments for any purpose
nor disclose their contents to any other person.**

**Please note that all e-mail messages sent to the Civil Aviation Authority
are subject to monitoring / interception for lawful business purposes.**

**This e-mail, and any files transmitted with it, are confidential.
If you are not the intended recipient, please notify our Help Desk
(e-mail: internet.postmaster@srg.caa.co.uk or phone: +44-1293-573333)
immediately.
You should not copy or use this e-mail or attachments for any purpose
nor disclose their contents to any other person.**

**Please note that all e-mail messages sent to the Civil Aviation Authority
are subject to monitoring / interception for lawful business purposes.**

**This e-mail, and any files transmitted with it, are confidential.
If you are not the intended recipient, please notify our Help Desk
(e-mail: internet.postmaster@srg.caa.co.uk or phone: +44-1293-573333)
immediately.
You should not copy or use this e-mail or attachments for any purpose
nor disclose their contents to any other person.**

**Please note that all e-mail messages sent to the Civil Aviation Authority
are subject to monitoring / interception for lawful business purposes.**

Fuel Dumping and Contrails



Fuel Dumping

The dumping of aviation fuel is an extremely rare event. Aviation Kerosene is a valuable commodity, and airlines will not want to waste it. Article 56 (3) (b) of the Civil Aviation Air Navigation Order 2000 permits the dumping of fuel in an emergency. It is recommended that jettisoning fuel should be carried out over the sea, or if this is not possible, above 10,000 feet to allow it to evaporate before it reaches the ground.

Other than in an emergency, when it may be necessary for the captain to reduce the weight of the aircraft quickly to effect a safe landing, jettisoning fuel would constitute an offence liable on summary conviction to a fine of up to £2,500 as proved for in Article 122 (5). As in any emergency the pilot and the air traffic controller would normally report the circumstances under the Mandatory Occurrence Reporting Scheme.

Contrails

Contrails (condensation trails) or artificial clouds may be formed when jet aircraft emit water vapour into the upper atmosphere resulting from the combustion of kerosene, the fuel used by aviation. This is not a new phenomenon, contrails have been documented since the 1940s.

Contrails form only when meteorological conditions are conducive. Generally, this is when the air mass into

which the water vapour is emitted is both cold and humid enough. Many contrails evaporate quickly, as the air is either too warm or not humid enough. If the conditions are conducive to sustain persistent contrails, they may spread out to form a cirrus cloud-like cover. It is quite possible that the incidence of persistent contrails is higher than say 10-20 years ago, simply as a result of increased air traffic.

A major scientific Report, Aviation and the Global Atmosphere, was published in 1999 by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. The Report assessed the current contribution of aviation to climate change and, based on a range of scenarios and

assumptions, forecast its contribution up to 2050. It estimated that contrails covered about 0.1% of the Earth's surface in 1992 and projected this cover would grow to 0.5% by 2050 (on middle range assumptions). Contrails continue to be the subject of research to help better understand both how they are formed and what effects they have on the atmosphere.

