



Airport Noise Abatement Consultative Committee (ANACC) Meeting Minutes

Date: Thursday 26th May 2016
Time: 0900 – 1200hrs (QLD Time)
Location: Twin Towns Resort – Visions Room

Members

Brett Curtis (Chairman)	Gold Coast Airport
Jemma Bishop (Secretary)	Gold Coast Airport
Melissa Pearce	Gold Coast Airport
Neil Hall	Airservices Australia
Audra Topping	Tugun Progress Association
Barry Jephcote	SECCA
Bill Pinkstone	Banora Point & District Residents Association
Brad Pearce	Tweed Shire Council
David Gray	Bilinga Neighbourhood Watch
Garth Threlfall	Friends of Currumbin
Graham Quick	Jetstar
Josh Ireland	Department of Infrastructure
Lindy Smith	Tweed Heads Residents & Ratepayers Association
Rod Bates	Proxy for John Alcorn - ACCA
Wilf Ardill	Tugun Village Community Centre Association

Observers

Karen Morrison	Fingal Heads
Pat Tate	Banora Point & District Residents Association
Richard Anderson	Farrants Hill

Apologies

Cathy Osbourne	Gold Coast Lifestyle Association Burleigh Heads
David McNeil	Tigerair
Helen Twohill	Fingal Head Community Association
Jodie Bellchambers	Office of Jusine Elliot
John Alcorn	Airport Central Corridor Alliance
John Hicks	Palm Beach
Julie Murray	Kingscliff
Justine Elliot	Member for Richmond
Matt Bender	Gold Coast Airport
Natasha McFarlane	Tigerair
Peter Long	General Aviation
Val Kirk	Kingscliff

1. Opening and Welcome

Brett Curtis (Chairman Proxy for Matt Bender) opened the meeting at 09.05 and welcomed members and observers to the May ANACC Meeting.

2. Apologies and Proxies

As recorded above.

3. Acceptance of Minutes of Previous ANACC Meeting

The previous meeting's Record of Proceedings was accepted by the Group with adjustments from Lindy Smith.

4. Business Arising from Minutes

JWS Survey Questions

The Survey report on the ILS website contains those answers, I will circulate the report. All the questions and answers are listed on page 18.

- **ITEM CLOSED**

ANACC Northern Membership

Northern Subcommittee have met to discuss the applications and nominations received. We are currently investigating further into active groups north of the airport that would be appropriate. We have identified a couple other alternatives. Will carry the action over to the next meeting.

- **ITEM OPEN**

ANACC Members Section Online

Members Online is completed, Brett Curtis showed the committee the new webpage and how to navigate. The website link will distributed shortly.

- **ITEM CLOSED**

ASA Webtrack Accuracy

Webtrack is based off a combination of information from Air Traffic Control and Noise Monitor Information. Our understanding is that it would be as accurate as the ATC information.

- **ITEM CLOSED – WITH NOTE**
- **NOTE - Bill Pinkstone disagrees the Item is closed.**

Runway 14 Departure Trial

Neil Hall will provide an update during her presentation to the Committee, a copy of Neil's presentation is attached to these minutes

- **ITEM OPEN**

5. Correspondence

IN	OUT
1/04/16 Angela Robertson (Bilambil Heights) to ANACC Mailbox	04/04/16 M.Bender to Angela Robertson (Bilambil Heights)
4/04/16 Zac Eaton (Mermaid Beach) to ANACC Mailbox	05/04/16 M.Bender to Zac Eaton (Mermaid Beach)
5/04/16 Logan Hurford (Palm Beach) to ANACC Mailbox	29/04/16 M.Bender to Logan Hurford (Palm Beach)
7/04/16 Nigel King (Currumbin Waters) to ANACC Mailbox	11/04/16 M.Bender to Nigel King (Currumbin Waters)
13/04/16 Scotty Ze (Undisclosed) to ANACC Mailbox	
15/04/16 Logan Hurford (Palm Beach) to ANACC Mailbox	29/04/16 M.Bender to Logan Hurford (Palm Beach)
17/04/16 Darren Williams (Undisclosed) to ANACC Mailbox	22/04/16 M.Bender to Darren Williams
24/04/16 Kamila Goodchild (Banora Point) to ANACC Mailbox	29/04/16 M.Bender to Kamila Goodchild (Banora Point)
25/05/16 John Alcorn (ACCA) to ANACC	
08/03/16 Lindy Smith to J.Bishop	01/03/16 J.Bishop on behalf of R.Eddy to ANACC
	02/03/16 J.Bishop on behalf of M.Pearce to ANACC
	08/03/16 J.Bishop on behalf of M.Bender to ANACC
	18/03/16 J.Bishop on behalf of Rhiannon Eddy to Helen Twohill
	23/03/16 J.Bishop to Lindy Smith

The committee received a detailed letter from John Alcorn to raise a motion on the actions made by Airservices Australia. Neil Hall Airservices Australia provided the following response to the committee.

John's concern related to international arrivals 32. Community expectation is that in bad weather aircraft would use the offset approach and in fine weather use the straight in approach. Airservices Australia is still doing what they have always done, and we still have that commitment. The issue is that with the CASA Mandate in February that all aircraft will use GPS based systems. They won't fly the VOR/RNP approaches in future. The percentages are going to change but that is an ongoing discussion to work out what we need to do.

John says in his email that this is a *"change in procedure and effectively is a change to the flight path, so why hasn't an environmental impact assessment been carried out."*

We haven't changed the procedures, we haven't changed the flight path, and it's only the use of the flight path that has changed. It's CASA mandated, not something that Airservices Australia has control over and it doesn't require an environmental impact assessment. Under the legislation it is only when Airservices Australia change a procedure and put the flightpath in a new place that we have to do the assessment. If the procedure is used more there is no requirement to perform an Environmental Assessment. In effect we are still using the offset, and the straight in approach ATC procedures haven't changed, the way the aircraft are using the approaches has changed.

“When Airservices conducted the 14 trial they insisted that because it was a change to the current flight path a full public consultation along with environment impact had to be done. When it was pointed out that a simple solution to the Farrent’s Hill community would have been to add an earlier turn, Airservices said it could not be done because it was a change that would have required a full review for this new turn and there would not be done.”

When we put the trial in and we did the Environmental Assessment, we did consider Farrent’s Hill. What we didn’t realise that by turning the weighpoint into a flyby we were actually concentrating the flight path over the Hill. We didn’t pick that up in the Environmental Assessment. We set about looking for a solution for Farrent’s Hill if the trial was to go ahead. We put the solutions to our technical group and they made the decision, for the trial not to continue.

That’s the process we followed, so when he says *“Airservices it could not be done because it was a change that would have required a full review for this new turn and there would not be done.”* We actually did do the assessment.

<u>Question/Discussion</u>	<u>Response</u>
<p>Rod Bates – <i>I think where John is coming from in this is that in a previous ANACC meeting, advice was given that all international aircraft required an instrument approach. Now the aircraft will not be flying in using the instrument approach they are flying the straight in approach from the south. That puts additional aircraft over the Central Corridor Alliance that we didn’t have before. John is saying that it’s unfair on the residents within that area. That is why he put the motion forward, his main issue is that there was no consultation in terms of the movement of those aircraft from the VOR to the straight in approach and the additional burden of the noise on the Central Corridor Alliance.</i></p>	<p>Neil Hall – <i>I understand concerns about the concentration down that Central Corridor, which is as you said why we developed the trial, to try to give relief to those in the area. Obviously the trial didn’t succeed, so we are back to where we were before. It is important to understand that Airservices is not in a position in which where we can change the use of the flight paths. We have kept all our procedures the same, we put a trial in, it was unsuccessful so we have changed it back to exactly as it was before.</i></p>
<p>Rod Bates – <i>It’s not exactly as it was before, because you are now introducing a fly over not a flyby.</i></p>	<p>Neil Hall – <i>I will address that in my presentation, I will talk about that then. From our point of view we don’t believe we have changed anything, in terms of the CASA requirement yes things have changed slightly. I am happy to commit to the meeting that Airservices will provide a proposal for the next ANACC meeting. In terms of consultation we will consult to the community on how the flightpaths will be used in the future, what the limitations are in terms of who can and can’t use them and how we might propose how they may be used.</i></p>
<p>Bill Pinkstone – <i>Just a point that has been missed in this, when John raised this two meetings ago in the subcommittee meeting. Regarding the ILS on the northern approach, John was of the understanding and I believe that it was confirmed that all international aircraft approaching from the</i></p>	<p>Neil Hall – <i>I think the issue there is that other than Australian and New Zealand international carriers, international aircraft must fly instrument approaches they are not allowed to fly visual approaches in Australia. From the north, because the ILS was going in, we said to the community during the consultation</i></p>

north will use the ILS or the instrument approach and that was the directive.

of the ILS there was no definitive straight option as in runway alignment instrument approach at that time for international operators so they were using the VOR and the RNAV approach, they were the two options at the time when we went out to consultation. When the ILS goes in we will ask them to use the offset approaches as much as we can, but at the end of the day it is the pilot's decision as to which approach they use. From the south we have an instrument approach straight in and that's the RNAV, the offset instrument approach which is the VOR approach.

Lindy Smith – I would like to support Bill, Rod and John on this. On that what went on all those years ago was certainly very specific in those plans. The issue with the north it did state in the preliminary document that there was a commitment for the international airlines to continue to use the current procedures, however this has now been removed from the final document, I just want to clarify that. What we are getting here is very conflicting and confusing information from the north to the south.

Neil Hall – I disagree with that, I don't think that there is any conflicting information. We were very clear to the community that the only option for the international other than the ILS from the north was the RNP.

Neil Hall – We are well aware of the commitment that we made many years ago to use the offset approach to the south. It is still in Airservices procedures, what we want to do now is given the CASA requirements is confirm what is it that we can do to provide the community as much offset as has been used historically. My proposal is that I come back to the next meeting and have that discussion then.

Brett Curtis – Proposed Motion: Airservices to come back to the committee with a description of the CASA mandate, how that impacts the current arrangement and how they intend to go forward.

Bill Pinkstone supported and Lindy Smith seconded the motion.

6. General Aviation Update

Peter Long is absent from today's meeting, we are still searching for assistance in the GA area.

7. Airservices Report

Neil Hall provided a presentation to the Committee, a copy of Neil's presentation is attached to these minutes.

<u>Question/Discussion</u>	<u>Response</u>
Bill Pinkstone – Where are the waypoints?	Neil Hall – The waypoints have not changed, they will still be at the Sewer Treatment Plant. This is an exaggeration of what will happen. The only change was to change that to a flyover.
	Graham Quick – Aircraft are still relatively slow at that point as they're not far from the runway that will tighten the turn.
	Neil Hall – That's the extreme we are looking at 100mtrs at the absolute maximum.
Barry Jephcote – One thing that concerns me, it's come from East Banora since this trail was passed where East Banora said that as long as the actually planes weren't flying even further to the east. Now what we are saying that we are not going back to the original procedure it's quite obvious that the planes will be coming even further to the east.	Neil Hall – There is not much we can do about the change in design criteria. One thing I did say to the CACG was to bear in mind that if we have to revert back to what we had before it will have to be reassessed and it has to conform to criteria. Once again requirements and technology are continually changing. I can only give a commitment what I know, if things change we don't have any option.
Barry Jephcote – When was that change brought in? In the letter you send out you said that there was a change in operational procedures. "Limitations that were updated in 2015" When in 2015 were they updated? This trial only started 6 months ago?	Neil Hall – Consultation for the trail was well before that. When I made the initial commitment we talked about things may change it was before the procedures were updated. The issues is the instrument flight procedures designers have guidelines that they follow. When the original flight path was put in many years ago, the behaviours of the airplane were different. Absolutely I have said to them that I need the flightpath to look exactly as it did before, and this is what they have come back with.
Barry Jephcote – I would suggest that it is a change in flight path	Neil Hall – Internally within Airservices Australia we have said that the variation is between the existing noise contours to make sure the noise impacts are the same.
	Brett Curtis - Given that the procedure is in the process of being publish on the 23 rd of June. I would suggest to monitor from that date to see if you notice any difference in noise.
Barry Jephcote – What is the distance from the airport to the threshold?	Neil Hall – in terms of the graphic, I'm not sure. The graphic is just to demonstrate the width of the noise footprint.
	Brett Curtis – Neil can you come back to the committee with the distance from the airport to noise footprint and the ground location of where the footprint actually is, as well as the height at that time.

8. General Business

Development update

ILS Update

An appeal has been lodged with the Administrative Appeals Tribunal to review the Minister's decision to approve the ILS MDP.

Associated with this appeal, an application for a Stay of works has also been lodged with the AAT. A decision on the Stay application is expected next week, accordingly no physical works for the ILS will commence until a decision on the Stay application is known. A decision on the ILS is expected to be made by December this year.

Airport Master Plan

GCAPL have started preparation of the 2017 preliminary draft Master Plan as the current 2011 Master Plan is due to expire in May 2017.

The next ANACC committee will start discussing what's included in the plan, particularly in the aviation component as well as the ANEF that is within the Master Plan.

A 60 business day Public consultation on the preliminary draft Master Plan is expected to commence mid-October.

ANACC Membership

ANACC membership is a 3 year duration, so we will start reviewing the current memberships. Following the next meeting we will be requesting votes for the next ANACC committee members.

<u>Question/Discussion</u>	<u>Response</u>
Garth Threlfall – <i>When is construction of the new LIFT building being started?</i>	Brett Curtis – <i>LIFT is progressing as we described last time, we are finalising the design and working with a builder to get prices. Works are expected to start late July early August. All works are on track.</i>
Garth Threlfall – <i>What about the pollution testing, we are getting a lot of enquiries about Coolangatta Creek. Has there been any discussion on that?</i>	Brett Curtis – <i>This pollution is associated with the historic use of Airservices Firefighting Foam. The Airport and Airservices are working together to understand the issue in line with the guidelines that have been prepared by the department.</i>
Wilf Ardill – <i>There have been some concern about the outflow from Coolangatta Creek to the beach at Kirra. We just need to know what's happening.</i>	Brett Curtis – <i>At the next CACG meeting there will be an update provided by Airservices on this issue</i>
The Chair asked if anyone on the Committee had anything else they would like to raise and discuss.	
Lindy Smith – <i>With the presentation from Airservices at the last meeting on the reinstalment of the Noise Monitors in South Tweed, it was</i>	Brett Curtis – <i>I thought it was confirmed at the last meeting that it was being reinstalled on the south side of the creek?</i>

<p><i>resolved in the Feb 2015 meeting that it would be reinstated at West Tweed. For a considerable length of time there has been no monitoring at West Tweed and it appears now that there will be no reinstatement. This is an area that is impacted by noise.</i></p>	
<p>Lindy Smith – <i>In South Tweed.</i></p>	
<p>Lindy Smith – <i>You have an area that is impacted by noise that is not being monitored</i></p>	<p>Neil Hall – <i>We have to locate a place on the departure path where the property owner is happy to have the monitor on their property, the ambient noise around is appropriate. Unfortunately we can't always put it where community representatives think it should go in terms of collecting their particular concerns about noise.</i></p>
<p>Lindy Smith – <i>It's becoming a common theme across the tweed in the lack of adequate NCIS response to their complaints.</i></p>	<p>Brett Curtis – <i>It would be interesting to see the people contacting NCIS and not getting a response.</i></p>
<p>Lindy Smith – <i>It is becoming a really consistent theme. We see in the minutes the correspondence that has come in and out with no detail, reports used to be provided to ANACC to see how these complaints are being addressed. I assume that these reports are still being put together? ANACC haven't been provided them for years.</i></p>	<p>Neil Hall – <i>What report are you referring to?</i></p>
<p>Lindy Smith – <i>Airservices Noise and Flight Path Monitoring System</i></p>	<p>Neil Hall – <i>Those reports will be available online from July, the report available from the Airservices website. These reports will be updated more regularly from July.</i></p>
	<p>Brett Curtis – <i>We will circulate the link through the ANACC and put a link on the new website.</i></p>
<p>Lindy Smith – <i>Council planning have provision in place in particularly around the ANEF where residents have the opportunity when purchasing a house to determine if the site is affected by aircraft noise which I think is a significant issue. Where residents are claiming they have purchased their home away from the flight path and now they are getting aircraft.</i></p>	<p>Brett Curtis – <i>Are these RPT Jet movements?</i></p>
<p>Lindy Smith – <i>Yes Terranora, Bilambil, East of Duckat St.</i></p>	<p>Brett Curtis – <i>I'm not sure on any change that would have resulted in that regularly occurring.</i></p>
<p>Lindy Smith – <i>I've lived in the area for 40 years, and there has been significant growth. Certainly Flight paths ad those processes there has been no radical changes.</i></p>	<p>Brett Curtis – <i>If these queries are being reported to NCIS and they are not appropriate response I'm sure Neill will follow up on that,</i></p>
	<p>Neill Hall – <i>NCIS have a requirement to respond to every complaint in 21 days, which they do 100%. People are often not happy with the response, I think</i></p>

	<i>the level of the response varies on the level of information that NCIS gets.</i>
	Brett Curtis – <i>I've had the NCIS contact me to see if there was anything that might have generated the query. They do a bit of investigating in terms of unusual requests.</i>
	Neill Hall – <i>A good example is we had Hong Kong airlines turning early, the NCIS was alerted through a complaint they gave it to me to investigate, and I spoke to the chief pilot of Hong Kong Airlines and he has addressed the complaint.</i>

The Chair reminded the Committee of the proposed dates for this year's meetings:

- 27th October

Proposed meeting dates for 2017: TBA

The Chair closed the meeting at 11.54 am

ANACC COMMITTEE ACTIONS - Next Meeting Thursday 26th May

Date	Action Item	Action Officer	Status	Action	Complete Date
16 Jun 11	ANACC Northern Membership	Brett Curtis	OPEN	BCurtis to meet with GThrelfall to discuss northern members and define territories.	
19 Mar 12				BCurtis advised will be taken into consideration during TOR review.	
8 Jun 12				TOR will be reviewed & submitted to the committee by 1 July.	
13 Sept 12				Committee to discuss at September meeting.	
6 Dec 12				1 Vacant position for both southern/northern ends. BCurtis to discuss with PDonovan membership requirements	
28 Feb 13				Chair will follow up on this action item in 2013	
25 July 13				Chair has made contact with RWorkman, & info pack sent out. Chair to meet with Ron to finalise membership.	
31 Oct 13				Northern Membership will be finalised as part of the membership renewal process.	
27 Feb 14				RWorkman is available but needs to be voted in be a community group.	
5 Jun 14				Two potential northern groups have been identified through CACG restructure, discussions will be held in an attempt to secure a northern representative for ANACC.	
30 Oct 14				Broadbeach Neighbourhood Watch has been approached to provide a representative.	
26 Feb 15				Northern member still required. It is hoped someone will be identified through the upcoming ILS community consultation process.	
25 Jun 15				Northern membership continues to be sought preferably from the Mermaid Beach region.	
29 Oct 15				The Chair noted a number of potential candidates have been identified to the north, a decision on the northern representative will not be made until a determination on the approval of ILS. A potential candidate has been identified by Bill Pinkstone to fill the southern position representing the Bilambil/Terranora area and this will be investigated further.	
				Chair advised this action will be on hold until a decision is reached on the ILS.	

25 Feb 16 30 March 16				The Chair advised that the ILS has been approved as of 19 Jan. The chair met with the Northern ANACC Members to discuss potential candidates.	
8 Dec 1 8 Mar 12 8 Jun 12 28 Feb 13 31 Oct 13 27 Feb 14 5 Jun 14 30 Oct 14 26 Feb 15 25 June 15 29 Oct 15	ANACC Members Section Online	Brett Curtis	OPEN	BCurtis to determine whether a Members Only section of ANACC could be developed. GCAPL currently investigating and will update at next meeting. This item will be reviewed once the TOR is agreed upon. Chair to discuss with GCAPL Comms/IT to discuss options. Investigations are ongoing to find the best method for communication. CACG website being developed leading to development of a similar ANACC website. ANACC section to be incorporated into the CACG website, concept to be provided at the next meeting. ANACC link to be incorporated as part of the current CACG website. Work is in progress with GCAPL Communications and IT. Work is progressing on this web site and advice will be provided to the committee when the site is available. Website has been designed and is awaiting feedback from the Chair.	
26 Feb 15 25 Jun 15 29 Oct 15 25 Feb 16	Webtrack Inspection	Airservices	OPEN	ASA to investigate Webtrack inaccuracies based on feedback given by members and residents. Field inspection completed with Bill Pinkstone and Nick Seselja. Inspection to be arranged with Bill Pinkstone and Airservices at Lochlomond Drive with hand held noise monitors. AsA to contact BPinkstone in regards to the Webtrack inaccuracies	
29 Oct 15 25 Feb 16	Runway 14 Departure Trial	Airservices	CLOSED	Nick Seselja to provide additional data to the Committee in relation to what areas complaints concerning the Runway 14 Departure Trial have been received from. Rhiannon Eddy provided a detailed presentation.	
26 May 16	Noise Location	Airservices	OPEN	Distance from the airport to small and the ground location of small is, as well as the height.	

26 May 16	Curfew Administration Report	Dept. of Infrastructure	OPEN	To follow up on the curfew administration	
26 Feb 15 25 Jun 15 29 Oct 15 25 Feb 16	Reinstatement of Permanent Noise Monitors	Airservices	CLOSED	ASA to follow-up the re-instatement of permanent noise monitors and provide feedback to the committee. Works are progressing with the installation. Noise monitor currently being installed. Item closed, Noise Monitor installed, AsA will update on the results at next ANACC.	