OFFICIAL



BACACG MEETING MINUTES

Location:	BAC Head Office, 11 The Circuit, Brisbane Airport, 4008 QLD
Date:	Tuesday 17 September 2024
Chair	Nigel Chamier AM
Attendees	Nigel Chamier (Chair) Tim Roskams (Community representative for Federal Seat of Brisbane) Matt Loveday (Community representative for Federal Seat of Bonner) Karilyn Beiers (Community representative for Federal Seat of Bowman) Dr. Sean Foley (Community representative for Federal Seat of Griffith) Scott Mitchell (Virgin Australia) Marion Lawie (Airservices Australia) Donna Marshall (Airservices Australia) Sian Balogh (BAC) Portia Allison (BAC) Daniel Yelf (BAC) Helen Clarke (BAC) Helen Woodrow (BAC) Rachel Crowley (BAC)
Attendees (online)	Caroline Hauxwell (Community representative for Federal Seat of Ryan) Daniel Ryan (Community representative for Federal Seat of Lilley) Chris Kang (Community representative for State Seat of Clayfield) Michael Hawkins (Community representative for Federal Seat of Dickson) Andrew Marshall (Federal Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development, Communications and the Arts) Thomas Stacey (BCC) Neil Bain (Airservices Australia) Siobhan Cornett (Airservices Australia) Andy Bauer (Virgin Australia) Observer: Rhys Moore (Archerfield Airport)
Apologies	Professor Laurie Buys (Community representative for Federal Seat of Moreton) Joshua Kindred (Community representative for Federal Seat of Petrie) Brendan Mead (Qantas) Stefan Smerdon (ANO) Henry Tuttiett (BAC) Tim Boyle (BAC)

AGENDA ITEMS

10 am

Chair:

Welcome.

Acknowledgement of Country.

Confirmed the minutes for the last BACACG meeting on the 25 June 2024.

Chair update:

- Welcomed Matt Loveday as the new Community Representative for the Federal Seat of Bonner and thanked former member Darryl Wilson for their contribution.
- Welcomed new representative, Helen Woodrow (HW), Airspace Implementation Manager at BAC.
- Welcomed new representative, Andrew Marshall (AM), Federal Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development, Communications and the Arts.
- Acknowledged Rhys Moore from Archerfield Airport as a silent observer.
- Chair advised they have received invitations from Airservices Australia interim CEO and newly appointed Brisbane Airport Airspace Advisory Board (AAB) to meet and will provide any updates in future meeting/s.
- Chair acknowledged the release of the Aviation White Paper since the last BACACG meeting.
- Chair reaffirmed the topic of aircraft noise is the primary remit of the AAB, and BACACG's remit is broader.

BACACG Secretary Update:

Sian Balogh (SB), Community Engagement Manager at BAC and BACACG Secretary, provided an update of incoming and outgoing correspondence to the BACACG email inbox and incoming aircraft noise feedback.

SB advised that there were no outstanding actions for BAC.

BAC Update | Passenger + Aviation & Community

Daniel Yelf (DY), Hub Development & Analytics Manager at BAC, provided an update on aviation since the previous June meeting. DY advised that REX has reduced flights at BNE due to the cancellation of flights operated by their 737 aircraft. 114 flights per week were cancelled as a result with regional services remaining. One flight scheduled after 10pm was also cancelled due to the changes.

DY advised that the September and October period is peak time for domestic travel, with significant sporting events, school holidays and public holidays occurring close together. DY advised of international growth, including new routes (notably American Airlines operating from BNE to DFW and Delta Airlines operating from BNE to LAX). DY advised that some new routes and additional flights will operate between 10pm to 6am. DY advised some of the growth affecting the 10pm to 6am timing is seasonal and will be related to the December and January school holidays.

Questions:

 The Community Representative for the Federal Seat of Griffith advised concern about additional night-time flights and that there is no evidence that abatement procedures will be in effect. The representative questioned what was being done to help the community. DY advised that Emirates (night-time flight that is serviced by a B777 will increase capacity and be serviced by an A380) has agreed to take a voluntary departure tailwind of 7 knots to increase operations over the bay. Rachel Crowley (RC), Executive General Manager Communications and Public Affairs at BAC, advised that BAC is looking into a night-time policy to establish what options would work for the benefit of the community, without the effect of unintended consequences from implemented policies. RC advised that the nighttime policy would look at ways to reduce the impact of overnight activity while still meeting obligations to the public that want to travel.

- The Community Representative for the Federal Seat of Bonner queried whether any of the evening flights were subsidised by the government. DY advised that the Emirates and Cathay Pacific Flights are subsidised through governmental programs and that the timing of the flights is associated with connections to further destinations, for example, transfers onto European countries. DY advised that earlier flights times would affect these connections and would be commercially sub-optimal. The representative questioned whether subsidies could be increased to cover a short fall if an early flight time was made as a temporary solution.
- The Community Representative for the Federal Seat of Ryan questioned what data BAC was using to develop its night-time policy. RC advised that BAC is reviewing night-time operations and looking at operational behaviour. The representative advised that the noise monitoring data from Airservices Australia is not sufficient. RC advised that BAC is reviewing data related to aircraft movements, not noise specifically.
- The Community Representative for the Federal Seat of Brisbane advised that the Emirates A380 flight is not a considerate flight and was surprised that we state that Emirates are supportive of noise mitigation procedures.

SB provided an update on the community engagement activities undertaken by BAC since the last BACACG meeting. Including:

- Attendance with the Brisbane Airport Mobile Information Van at the Teneriffe Festival, Samford Show, and Luminous Festival at South Bank.
- Partnership with United Airlines and Aviation Australia to deliver Immersion Expereince Program for aviation students.
- Therapy Dogs in the terminals during the School Holidays.
- Support and involvement with the Forgotten Women's Live Like Her Challenge at the Skygate precinct.

Brisbane Airport Master Plan update

Helen Clarke (HC), Program Manager – 2026 Master Plan at BAC, provided an update on the 2026 Master Plan. The 2026 Master Plan relates to the development plans to support the future growth of Brisbane airport. HC advised that in accordance with the *Airports Act* community consultation will occur before it is submitted to the government for approval.

The Master Plan will look at the next 20 years and set out what is needed in terms of infrastructure. HC advised that long term estimates of passenger numbers in the next 20 years indicate 18 million international passengers and 38 million domestic passengers per year. Estimates also indicate an increase to 55,000 employees onsite across an estimated 1100 business. These forecasts are derived from macroeconomic indicators and also consider population forecasts released by the Queensland Government on the number of residents within Brisbane and Queensland.

HC advised the Master Plan considers what services and facilities will be required to support the growth in passenger numbers and additional workforce. HC advised key aspects of the master plan will include terminal planning, decarbonisation, and connectivity for public and active transport users. HC advised the planning of Terminal 3 is also included in the Master Plan. HC advised climate change and adaptation is a significant consideration, while BAC will reach scope 1 and 2 emissions decarbonisation in 2025 the Master Plan will also look at ways to support other organisations in achieving decarbonisation targets.

HC advised that airspace and aircraft noise is included in the Master Plan through noise contours and the use of ANEF contours. HC advised that ANEF is a land use planning tool supplied to the Queensland Government and Brisbane City Council (BCC) to be used as a part of building approvals

and developments in the vicinity of Brisbane Airport. HC advised that under requirements for the National Airport Safeguarding Framework that noise above contours will also be included.

HC advised that community consultation will begin around the middle of 2025- HC advised that the current timeline indicates a final Master Plan is anticipated by mid-2026.

Questions:

- The Community Representative for the Federal Seat of Ryan questioned whether the ANEF contours and modelling will include areas over the wider Brisbane region, and if there were any plans for the crosswind runway. HC advised that the crosswind runway has been decommissioned and there are no plans for that runway in the Master Plan. HC advised that parts of the National Airport Safeguarding Framework talk to information that would be beneficial for the community which go beyond the ANEF contours. HC advised that BAC continues to talk to BCC about aircraft noise and how it is considered in development applications. The representative indicated that upon building their property there was no communication about noise from BCC of which BCC indicated that the information was not available or provided.
- The Community Representative for the Federal Seat of Brisbane questioned what BAC was doing regarding noise mitigation with the forecasted increase in passengers and aircraft traffic. The representative indicated that quieter aircraft and ANEF contours are not sufficient. The representative also advised that existing noise monitoring conducted by the airport does not represent the experience of community members. HC advised that the purpose of the Master Plan relates to on-airport infrastructure. The representative queried whether the Legacy Runway could be extended. RC (Rachel Crowley) advised that the approach lines are in wetland and there is no extra space to extend closer to the water. HC confirmed that there is no medium or long term need to extend the existing runways. The representative questioned if the Terminal 3 development would allow the use of the crosswind runway. RC advised that the crosswind runway is not an option and CASA restrictions made it unusable at night prior to it being decommissioned.
- The Community Representative for the Federal Seat of Griffith questioned what the Master Plan will do in relation to legislative requirements for decreases in emissions. RC advised that BAC will meet net zero for scope 1 and 2 emissions in 2025, with scope 3 emissions being aircraft fuel and other organisations onsite. RC advised information about BAC's sustainability programs will be shared through the BACACG Secretariat to him.

Federal Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development, Communications and the Arts Update

Andrew Marshall (AM), Director QLD, SA & NT Airports with the Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development, Communications and the Arts, advised they are new to the role and will be in a position to provide an update, including information about the release of the Aviation White Paper, in the next meeting.

Airservices Australia Update

Marion Lawie (ML), Airservices Australia, provide an update on the Noise Complaint and Information (NCIS) and Noise Action Plan for Brisbane (NAP4B). ML advised that noise complaint data for the previous months is available through 'Aircraft in Your Neighbourhood'. ML advised that Airservices saw an increase in complaints in August and received calls from the community regarding runway works on the Legacy Runway which occurred from July to September 2024.

ML provided an explanation of the types of engagement used during the different phases of the NAP4B (appendix 1). ML provided an update on Phase 4 which was completed in July 2024, Airservices received 256 submissions from 76 suburbs, with 190 attendees across 5 drop-in sessions and 3 webinars. ML also provided an interim update on Phase 5 engagement and advised that overall engagement during Phase 5 was higher than previous phases as the scope was broader and accompanied with a mail out, which has allowed for new people to be involved in the engagement process. ML advised that new

engagement comes with the challenge of educating members of the public on specific aviation conditions and requirements, which requires time and resources. ML advised that Phase 5 had only just completed and specific data is not currently available.

Community Representative General Business and Discussion

The Chair advised that additional time had been allocated for questioned raised by the Community Representative for the Federal Seat of Brisbane, including:

- Q&A on Airservices' engagement of and result of TRAX's design of the new phase 3 concepts of the Noise Action Plan for Brisbane and subsequent actions/timelines
- Q&A on Noise Action Plan Package 3 and the lack of meaningful relief from "slight" changes
- Q&A on Noise Action Plan Package 4 progress update
- Q&A on revisiting the Noise Abatement Procedure for Departing flights that keeps aircraft on SIDs and ATC procedures to Vector to share noise
- Q&A on noise sensitive sites including schools/childcare centres/low ambient noise

Community discussion:

Community Representative for the Federal Seat of Brisbane

The representative questioned whether Webtrak uses 'satellite geospatial data' or the scheduled flight path when it shows the path of the aircraft. ML advised that Webtrak uses radar data and shows the accurate tracks of the aircraft.

The representative advised that community members that are within 20km of the airport see limited options within Phase 4 package 3 for them and would prefer the option within package 4 for the redesign of the airspace. ML advised that not actioning package 3 would be unfortunate for residents that would benefit from it. ML advised that not actioning package 3 would not necessarily bring package 4 closer as TRAX is exploring both packages simultaneously.

The representative questioned what evidence and/or justification metric is used by Airservices to determine how to share aircraft noise and what method does Airservices use to determine whether sharing aircraft noise will reduce overall harm. ML advised that package 4 would not solve all noise concerns, as people will still be exposed to noise. ML advised that NAP4B is not reducing noise and instead is about frequency and concentration. ML advised TRAX has developed a heatmap showing frequency and concentration of noise but is not a measure or model of noise, the heatmap is used to identify high frequency and concentration which can be addressed by changes to the flight paths.

The representative advised that the heatmap does not differentiate between the impact of noise during the day and noise at night. ML advised that the heatmap is a blunt tool and once areas have been identified they will be interrogated further for more specific details like decibel and time of day impacts.

The representative questioned how Airservices will come to the decision on over how many people and how frequently aircraft will fly. The representative advised there was no evident metric to determine what is fair and equitable. Donna Marshall (DM), Airservices Australia, advised that a range of criteria will be considered, however Airservices acknowledged that not everyone will agree with any decision made. DM advised that Airservices will consider impacts like, ambient noise, previous noise exposure, day versus night noise, aircraft type, jet versus non-jet aircraft, etc. DM advised that Airservices will review the best outcome however there is no specific equation as it is a subjective assessment. DM advised that feedback has shown that specific communities should not be without noise where others receive it.

The representative questioned whether residents that are aligned with the runway and/or live close to the airport won't get relief. DM advised that package 4 would assist residents aligned with the runway, but package 3 does not include the movement of way points. DM advised that runway

alignment requirements are an international aviation safety requirement and cannot be offset more than 15 degrees per those requirements.

Community Representative for the Federal Seat of Dickson

The representative advised that their community of Samford is well represented on the Brisbane Airport Airspace Advisory Board (AAB) and does not need to discuss the topic of aircraft noise in the BACACG forum. The representative advised that they would like the topic of noise to be balanced with other airport activities.

Community Representative for the Federal Seat of Lilley

The representative advised that the Lilley Electorate Office met with Airservices and wanted to pass along their thanks for the meeting. The representative advised there was a small increase in resident concerns, residents were provided fact sheets and directed to the Airservices website.

• Community Representative for the Federal Seat of Bonner

The representative advised they were impacted by the opening on the NPR. The representative advised that feedback from the community to the Federal Member for Bonner is that there is not enough significant change to benefit the community. The representative advised that the community would like to see package 3 accept the maximum 15-degrees of an offset for proposed flight path splits. The representative advised that the proposed 6 degrees is not sufficient for noise sharing. The representative advised of a split of a specific flight path proposed in package 3 to include more than 1 split. DM advised that the feedback was technical and would need to be referred directly to TRAX for consideration. DM advised that the 15-degree offset is more related to the departures from the runway rather than specific flight paths. The representative queried whether the option would be possible under package 4. ML advised that package 4 would be more suitable to exploring the proposal.

The representative questioned whether a progress report could be provided for package 4 as it has been worked on for 'years'. DM advised that package had not been worked on for 'years' and that due to COVID Airservices had to wait for a year per normal process before a review could start. DM advised that as the first year of operations was during COVID there were not enough regular operations to commence a review. DM advised that the Post Implementation Review (PIR) was completed at the end of 2022 and Airservices has been working through the recommendations since the beginning of 2023, and Airservices has only been able to work through the recommendations for a year and a half. DM advised that when TRAX commenced work, they started reviewing both package 3 and package 4 but do not yet have any concepts to share with the community on package 4. DM advised that when TRAX has information for the public, it will be shared, with current timing anticipated for middle of 2025. DM advised that the process for developing new flight paths is typically a 4-year process. DM advised that the current review is being done in a much shorter timeframe as it is a focus and is based on already understood operational requirements.

The representative questioned whether feedback, similar to information provided about the inclusion of way point locations in package 4, could be provided to the community. DM advised that the information about what is being considered as a part of package 4 is covered in the NAP4B and there is not currently additional information to be shared. ML advised they will circulate the NAP4B document that has explanation of what topics and matters package 4 includes.

The representative queried whether the noise abatement procedure for departures off 19L is to stop vectoring, and whether vectoring could be a short-term solution until package 4. DM advised that vectoring is a divisive topic and there is not a consensus on whether aircraft should vector or if they should stay on the published flight path for as long as possible. DM advised that vectoring is a standard tool for air traffic controllers, and controllers can vector aircraft above a certain point to avoid conflicts with other aircraft, to avoid weather, and a range of other reasons. DM advised that there are flight paths that are more subject to vectoring, including flight paths with more traffic. DM advised that a decision on vectoring has not been made.

Community Representative for the State Seat of Clayfield

The representative advised that the Pinkenba Community Association (PCA) is awaiting a follow up from the BCC regarding upgrades to the intersection of Lomandra Drive and Eagle Farm Road.

The representative advised they have concerns about projects in the next 6-12 months impacting the intersection further as they already find difficulty with turning right at the intersection. The representative advised they are aware BCC works with BAC but would appreciate communication directly to the PCA. Thomas Stacey (TS), Brisbane City Council, advised they would take the request on notice and seek additional information.

Community Representative for the Federal Seat of Bowman

The representative advised of comments made by Melbourne Airport's CEO with regard to the approval of Melbourne's Third Runway, that indicate Melbourne would learn from Brisbane Airport and work with the community on the development.

The representative provided details on their experience in the Redlands and with aircraft noise (appendix 2).

Community Representative for the Federal Seat of Griffith

The representative queried why a flight departure the previous evening departed over the city when the weather was calm and there was minimal traffic. The representative advised the decibel recoding was 77.8 dba. The representative also questioned which agency was responsible for making sure that aircraft did not exceed the maximum take-off weight and advised that aircraft were being overloaded. DM advised that aircraft are not being overloaded. Scott Marshall (SM), Virgin Australia, advised that aircraft are not overloaded, and it is not legal to do so. The representative advised that aircraft are lower and that there is anecdotal evidence. DM advised that maximum take-off weight is not exceeded and the height of which an aircraft flies is related to destination, type of aircraft, etc. DM advised that height is not under a noise abatement and falls to the pilot to decide on whether the aircraft can meet the height for the published flight paths or if it is safe to complete a radar departure. SM advised that based on reports of the wind conditions for the previous evening there was a tailwind that would have limited the ability for the aircraft identified by the representative to depart over the water. DM advised it is not the preference for aircraft to go over the city, however it is sometimes necessary due to weather conditions, aircraft type, runway lengthy, etc. SM advised that there is a limit of how heavy an aircraft can be, and that heavier aircraft may need the full length of a runway for take-off.

General Business:

The Community Representative for the Federal Seat of Brisbane advised they will submit questions for Airservices' response. DM advised that Airservices has received a significant number of written requests and due to resourcing and capacity limits cannot provide a firm timeline on when a written response will be provided to the representative. The representative questioned whether Airservices plans to provide N-Above contours for the whole city that are scalable at different decibel levels. ML advised that Airservices does not have the capacity to complete the request. DM advised that the request will be taken on notice, however there is significant challenge due to the contours changing based on different operations.

Close Meeting | Final Comments from Chair

Meeting closed at 12:10pm.

Next meeting 26th November – Action items below carried forward to next meeting.

Action Items	Owner(s)	Deadline	Status
Noise monitor raw data: AA is continuing discussions with the AAB on how to approach raw noise data, and an update will be provided at next meeting.	AA	Ongoing	In progress

BACACG Secretary to speak with Electorate Offices to confirm they are aware of how to communicate matters to BACACG members.	BAC	Ongoing	In progress
BACACG Secretary to share Sustainability Program information with the Community Representative for the Federal Seat of Griffith.	BAC	Next meeting	Complete
Airservices to share NAP4B document outlining scope of package 3 and package 4.	АА	Next meeting	Complete

APPENDICES

Appendix 1.

Under assessment				Other Noise improvement trials
Not progressing				departure to the west with pre-existing
On hold				jet early turn departures
In progress	progressed from Phase 2			baseline model
Completed	Package 4			
Key			 segregated modes 	turbo prop departures 5-
:	paths progressed from phase 1		Package 4	night-time over land departures
	Phases 1 & 2		departures	paths
	use progressed from	west of airport	o use	
		Fackage o	extending SODPROPS	
with nigh volumes	increase SODPROPS		Package 2	approach
and concentration of air traffic over areas	Archerfield: Standard Instrument Departures to	ight-time arrivals	increased reporting	increased reporting
Package 3	Package 2	Package 2	Package 1	Package 1
August-September 2024	May-July 2024	November 2023	August 2023	April-May 2023
Phase 5	Phase 4	Phase 3	Phase 2	Phase 1
Delivery supported by Trax International		Delivery by Airservices Australia	Delivery by Air	
austrana	e.	Noise Action Plan for Brispane update	on Plan for B	Noise Actio
airservices	-	-		
		OFFICIAL		

OFFICIAL

Appendix 2.

BACACG - 17 September, 2024 Karilyn Beiers - Community Representative for Bowman

Basis of Topics raised at the 17 September 2024 Meeting

Today my content will be a little different from the usual and will not require any answers. My focus is on the Redlands and its preservation.

Firstly, my history

In about 1951, at the age of 4, I vaguely remember climbing up a steep slope between the seats in what I now understand may have been a DC3.

On several occasions I was "unaccompanied baggage" handed into the care of, what was then, an "Air Hostess", at the door of an aircraft - a safe way to transport a child to a western NSW town.

Since that DC3, have been various helicopters, float planes and an amphibious Buccaneer Push Plane through to the A380 - sadly not the "Concorde". I held a Private Pilot Licence for a while in the 1980s.

I moved to the Redlands over 26 years ago, prior to the impact of aircraft noise!

About Our Redlands!

How many people here today have explored the Redlands?

The Redlands consists of the usual residential sprawl on land, once a market garden for Brisbane and known for its numerous strawberry fields, where a few remaining farming pockets still survive.

Not unlike other areas in Greater Brisbane, although town water is available, water tanks remain in use in many places. In my residential street, only 400 metres long ending at Moreton Bay, several residents have small tanks for drinking water as they consider rainwater is better than town water. Others have larger tanks for household use to preserve what would otherwise "go down the drain".

Sugar cane was first grown in Queensland near Ormiston House (c.1862). Remnants of the original slab hut still remain, as does the first school house (c.1868), now St Andrews Church, where a protective tin roof hides the original wooden shingles.

The Southern end of Moreton Bay contains no less than six true islands, home to about 10,000 residents, where general access is possible only by water.

Coochiemudlo ("Coochie"), a stone's throw from Victoria Point, is home to many full time residents. There is a little café, a beach bar and the locals re-enact the island's historical connection to Captain Matthew Flinders who landed there in about 1799 whilst endeavouring to find a navigable river at the Southern end of Moreton Bay.

Macleay, Russell, Lamb and Karragarra ("Karra"), together known as the Southern Moreton Bay Islands or "SMBI", are mostly residential with many residents regularly travelling to the mainland to shop and work.

North Stradbroke ("Straddie") is also home to many residents and is an important tourist destination. There is a gorge walk at Point Lookout, turtles, dolphins and sea birds to watch and migrating whales (refer Addendum) to be sighted. High above the popular surfing beach there is a view down along the many kilometres of white sand to the South. Only metres from the One Mile Jetty is the "Little Ship Club" where lunch can be enjoyed on the lawns overlooking the Bay.

Peel is close by, not populated, but Horseshoe Bay is frequented by numerous pleasure craft all year round. Peel was firstly a Quarantine Station in the early 1800s, an inebriate colony for Brisbane in the late 1800s and then, from 1907 to 1959, a "Leper Colony" - now called "Hansen's Disease".

Access to Peel is restricted past the outer beach area of Horseshoe Bay and the surrounding waters of the Marine Park have fishing restrictions.

The Friends of Peel Island assisted with the preservation of the island's heritage for many years and in 2020, when wound-up, in light of the medical association, donated \$10,000, the majority of the funds accumulated over the years, to the Queensland Branch of the Royal Flying Doctors Association.

St. Helena is not far away in the neighbouring electorate of Bonner. From the 1860s to the 1930s, it was a prison housing about 70 of the worst criminals in Queensland. The prison became known as the "hell hole of the Pacific". The buildings and cells were constructed by the prisoners and remnants of the stone walls and cells still remain.

So many places of interest in one small area - so close to the Brisbane CBD

All residents in Brisbane and the Greater Brisbane area must join with the Redlands to ensure these significant scenic, environmental and historical locations, so close by, can exist and thrive in the years to come, not only for ourselves, but for our children and their children, without the impact and disruption of aircraft noise - and worse, the possible destruction......

The Redlands needs your support!

Our aim is for departing aircraft to be directed "OVER THE OCEAN" - sufficiently removed from the vicinity of Point Lookout to ensure the area is not impacted by aircraft noise - to gain a substantially higher altitude before crossing the mainland at locations with less population density.

This "OVER THE OCEAN" solution is possible for flights to numerous destinations – ensuring the area around Point Lookout is avoided – before turning South towards SCOTT or North using GUMKI.

This will benefit not only the residents in the Redlands, but also residents in Brisbane and Greater Brisbane locations......but we need support from Brisbane residents to achieve our aim.

My understanding

- Under normal parallel runway operations at Brisbane Airport, depending on wind directions, aircraft must either arrive over land and depart over water - or vice versa.
- Any suggested "conflict" will be avoided during parallel runway operations, whether the wind has a Northerly or a Southerly component, as aircraft will arrive and depart in the same direction.
- Airservices regularly claims a "conflict" in SODPROPS mode, however, with a concerted and genuine effort, it is possible for any "conflict" during that mode to be eliminated, permitting the "OVER THE OCEAN" solution to be implemented.
- 4. Northern Moreton Bay may not have residential islands similar to those in Southern Moreton Bay, but residents to the North and West of the Airport could benefit from a comparable "OVER THE OCEAN" solution with aircraft remaining well to the East of Bribie Island.
- Airservices has stated on many occasions that departures to our Southern cities are the highest volume destinations from Brisbane Airport.
- 6. The "OVER THE OCEAN" solution will allow departing flights heading towards those Southern cities to use SCOTT and to remain "over water" ie the <u>OCEAN</u>, not the Bay for longer, before crossing the mainland further South of the Redlands, substantially higher, providing relief, not only for the Redlands, but also for residents in surrounding locations.
- It is possible the "OVER THE OCEAN" solution could be more effective than SODPROPS which, disregarding all the weather restrictions, remains dependent on traffic volumes.
- It would appear information released by Airservices may have led the people of Brisbane to be under the misconception that SODPROPS would alleviate their impact from aircraft noise by directing aircraft "over water", <u>a term rejected by Redlanders due to its lack of a definitive location or direction.</u>

- Redlanders consider Airservices did not adequately warn them that use of such term merely implied "around Mud Island before overflying the Redlands", effectively transferring the impact from Brisbane to the Redlands and contradicting a commitment not to relieve one area at the expense of another.
- 10. Disregarding reductions due to weather criteria or wind directions, my calculations. (which are open to inspection at any time) indicate that allowing for Airservices' quoted maximum of 20 arrivals per hour less than 10% of flights are able to operate in SODPROPS mode those being mainly between 10pm and 6am the time originally proposed for SODPROPS. Any possible extension of SODPROPS mode during the day is therefore doubtful. The percentage of possible flights is greatly reduced with the inclusion of weather criteria.
- The current SODPROPS mode appears to have resulted from the requirement to close the Southern end of the NPR for flights over the City between 10pm and 6am - the same hours as SODPROPS was initially intended to operate.
- SODPROPS is effectively a SINGLE RUNWAY OPERATION as existed prior to the opening of the NPR.
- 13. It is understood Airservices must address various claims, particularly :
 - a. ALL FLIGHTS MUST GO OVER WATER
 - b. CURFEWS BE IMPOSED, and
 - c. THE CROSS-WIND RUNWAY BE REOPENED

however it is noted a) it is not possible for all flights to go over water; b) curfews are unlikely despite the fact that a partial curfew already exists with the closure of the Southern end of the NPR between 10pm and 6am, and c) the cross-wind runway has been decommissioned and is not likely to be reopened, at least for the foreseeable future.

The "OVER THE OCEAN" solution does not amount to an unreasonable solution and it is hoped both AIRSERVICES and TRAX INTERNATIONAL take note and start showing a little more initiative in finding far better solutions, including the "OVER THE OCEAN" solution, for the benefit of all.

Thank you.

Karilyn Beiers Community Representative for Bowman

--000---

Addendum

Since the meeting, Moreton Bay has been identified as a potentially important area for "cetaceans", particularly as a resting and nursing area for Humpback Whale mothers and calves.

Resting behaviour occurs at or just below the surface of the water.

The weaker blows of the calves and resting individuals makes the shallow waters of Moreton Bay more suitable for this behaviour rather than the deeper water of the open ocean.

If we allow increasing aircraft to track over greater areas of water in Moreton Bay, particularly at the lower levels following departure, this behaviour could well be disturbed.

The "OVER THE OCEAN" solution is therefore more important as, when aircraft are "OVER THE OCEAN" where the water is deeper, there will be less impact on the residents of Brisbane, and, at the same time, we will be reducing the impact on this important species.

This is more reason for developing the "OVER THE OCEAN" solution.

--000---

Page 3 of 3