



COMMUNITY AVIATION CONSULTATION GROUP

2.00pm – Thursday, 28 July 2022

Ringer Room, CAG Office, Level 4, Plaza Offices West, Canberra Airport

MEETING NOTES

The Canberra Airport CACG membership consists of representatives from Canberra Airport, Community Groups, Aviation Industry Organisations, Government Agencies, Tourism Industry and Business groups.

The Independent Chair of the CACG is Bob Ross.

Independent CACG Chair & representing Pialligo Residents Association (PRA) and North Canberra Community Council (NCCC)
Canberra Airport Noel McCann, Director of Planning & Government Relations Michael Thomson, Head of Aviation Susan Mulligan, Executive Assistant Natalia Weglarz, Town Planner
Fernleigh Park Community Association (FPCA)
Jerrabomberra Residents Association (JRA)
Tuggeranong Community Council (TCC)
Weston Creek Community Council WCCC)
Gungahlin Community Council (GCC)
Queanbeyan-Palerang Regional Council (QPRC)
Airservices Australia (ASA)
Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development, Communications and the Arts (DITRDCA)
ACT Environment, Planning and Sustainable Development Directorate (EPSDD)
ACT Planning, Infrastructure and Regional Development Directorate (PIRDD)
Weetalabah Estate Executive Committee (Guest) (WEET)

Summary of Attendees

Community Groups Note: Chair represents 2	7	Canberra Airport	4
Queanbeyan-Palerang Regional Council	1	ACT Government	2
Commonwealth Government DITRDC ASA	3 4	Guest Total	1 22

1. MEETING FORMALITIES

1.1 Welcome and Notation of Apologies

The meeting commenced at 2.00pm.

The Independent Chair, Bob Ross, introduced himself and undertook a roll call of participants present in the Canberra Airport office.

Airservices, introduced themselves participating via Teams.

The following apologies were noted:

- Queanbeyan-Palerang Regional Council
- NSW Department of Planning and Environment
- RAAF 34 Squadron
- Aircraft Noise Ombudsman

1.2 Declaration of Impartiality by the Chair

As President of the Pialligo Residents Association as well as representing the North Canberra Community Council, the Chair declared that should any issues of impartiality be raised during the meeting, he would address them in an appropriate manner.

1.3 2022 CACG Representation

Persons nominated to represent their community groups were noted.

1.4a Notation of Correspondence since the last meeting

The correspondence was noted.

The Chair advised that a compendium of correspondence had been prepared by the CACG Secretariat if needed to assist in the discussion concerning Weetalabah residents.

1.4b 2022 Meetings/Consultations

The list of Meetings/Consultations attended by Canberra Airport to date in 2022 was noted.

2. ACCEPTANCE OF MEETING NOTES OF CACG MEETING HELD ON 17 MARCH 2022

The Meeting Notes of CACG Meeting held on 8 April 2021 were accepted.

3. GUEST SPEAKER

The Chair advised that due to unforeseen circumstances the guest speaker from Transport Canberra and City Services (TCCS) was unable to attend but would be pleased to speak at the next CACG Meeting.

4. ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION BY CACG

4.1 Tabling of submission from resident of Weetalabah

The meeting noted the tabling of the submission received from via distribution with the CACG Agenda to members on 22 July 2022.

4.2 Request by Weetalabah Estate Executive Committee for Chair to write to Airservices on their behalf to request a Noise Monitoring Device

The Chair invited WEET to speak and subsequently made the following statement:

"Weetalabah Estate is located approximately 8kms to the south east of Canberra airport. Weetalabah Estate was established in 2000 and is a private estate made up of 51 separate rural residential acreages, sections of community land and property, and private roadways.

Weetalabah is home to over 160 residents. The management of Weetalabah occurs through a Community management statement, and an Executive Committee of residents that are elected each year at our Annual General Meeting. I am the current Chairperson for Weetalabah Estate.

Approximately 12 months ago Weetalabah residents started to notice increases to air noise and flights occurring over Weetalabah Estate. A number of residents have made individual complaints to both AirServices Australia and Canberra Airport representatives.

Our research and communications indicate that smaller, turbo prop aircraft have been utilized as flights and travel increased post pandemic lockdowns. These aircraft land on Canberra airport's alternate runway 12/30, which means they need to make their approach to the airport over Weetalabah Estate.

My personal residence sits directly under the flight path for the approach to Canberra airport. If my husband and I have our windows open or are standing outside when a plane goes over our house, we have to stop talking as we are unable to hear each other. We have lived in the Estate for over 11 years and this level of noise has only occurred in the last 12 months.

The Weetalabah Executive committee would like to request the installation of a noise monitor in Weetalabah Estate. We would like to ensure that aircraft on approach to Canberra airport are not negatively impacting the health and well-being of our residents, as well as the natural environment that we live in. We feel the installation of a noise monitor would provide consistent, factual data to reinforce the observations and experience of our residents. Our hope is that AirServices Australia would then be able to

use this data to make improvements to the flight path over Weetalabah, thereby reducing the increased levels of noise we are now living with.

I would like to thank your Chairperson Bob Ross and Noel McCann for the opportunity to be invited today and address the concerns of our residents directly to this meeting. Thank you."

Refer to 5.2 for further consideration of this issue.

5. AIRSERVICES AUSTRALIA (ASA)

5.1 Weetalabah Estate – Outcome of ASA Investigation requested by the Chair on 24 March 2022

ASA spoke to the ASA presentation.

- For a pilot to use the RNP approach, the aircraft must be equipped but, importantly, the crew must be trained and approved by CASA.
- It is difficult to gather information on the operational decisions the pilots make in the cockpit. However, ASA will continue to explore different ways to show the data.
- Airservices does not have access to additional operational information about RNP at this time other than what is provided on the slides in the presentation.

ASA added that the RNP smart tracks are always available to pilots that are trained. One other element pilots consider in determining what approach to take is the weather conditions and if visibility is bad the approach pilots take is the straight-in ILS.

QPRC asked if those RNP numbers were consistent with past time periods or has there been an increase?

ASA advised it was difficult to answer that right now and to make direct comparisons given the recent volatility in traffic numbers as a result of COVID-19. On-time performance numbers are as low as 40 per cent in some cases right now and the airlines like them to be at least 80 per cent. We could possibly review previous slides we have provided to the CACG.

Noel noted the graph showed there has been a significant increase in aircraft movements since the end of March when traffic growth started at Canberra Airport. If we compared it with 2019 there might be some worthwhile data.

ASA encouraged members of the CACG, through Susan, to send him any questions or if they had any suggestions for the data to be shown differently.

Carwoola Weetalabah Estate Investigation

ASA continued the presentation:

- As aviation starts to recover and with the flights between Sydney and Canberra, relative to the period before when we were in COVID-19, communities across Australia really have started to notice aircraft noise.

- Runway 30 Arrivals – 2002 to 2021 (*slides 16-20*) - The key point is, you can see when we go back in time there has been a lot of non-jet aircraft (Turboprops) and they actually decrease over time. However, they are still flying the same approach as in 2002.

Findings – Runway 30 Arrival Investigation (slide 21)

ASA advised as a consequence of the investigation requested by the Chair, it is not a favourable outcome for moving the flight path and aircraft noise as has been suggested by some Weetalabah residents for the following reasons:

- The visual approach to Runway 30 has not changed since at least 2006.
- Historically, the lateral navigation of aircraft has been less accurate. The figures showing flight tracks from 2002 to 2021 show a larger natural spread of tracking in 2002 which has been steadily improving with time as navigational tolerances have improved. The visual segment of the approach to Runway 30 is flown visually by the pilots and remains subject to variations.
- The LAMIG waypoint was defined around 8 years ago. This is the turn from the base leg into final. This is a fly-by point and was created to give the higher performing aircraft a more accurate position to aim at for their turn into final.
- In the last 10 or so years, the larger aircraft that fly this approach are less likely to alter their profile (lateral or vertical) unless they absolutely are required to do so. Their company standard operating procedures (SOPs) state that they must stay on profile and within very strict parameters.
- The number of arrivals to Runway 30 have been steadily falling from 3853 in 2002 to 864 in 2021 (May to October). There were 2400 turboprop arrivals in 2002 compared with 428 in 2021 (May to October).
- Moving the waypoint would not necessarily move the noise as the approach remains visual, however, this could have the impact of shifting the noise to other nearby communities with little benefit to the Weetalabah Estate as noise would remain broadly similar.

ASA added that there are restrictions on the use of Runway 30 at night and the noise being experienced by the community under the visual approach to Runway 30 is mainly daytime noise.

WEET said unlike some Weetalabah residents, she and her husband were not a fan of moving the LAMIG as that would just move the noise onto other communities. She indicated her agreement with ASA's findings of the investigation.

QPRC asked if ASA expected those flight numbers to be consistent into the future?

ASA said he hoped aviation does recover and that we have the connectivity in Australia that we need to communities, for each other and globally. Predicting how the traffic will recover was very difficult and he was not able to give a strong indication of which way it would go, however it would be some time before we get to the 2002 levels. We can look to the Master Plan (Chapter 12 Aircraft Noise), Aircraft Noise Exposure Forecast (ANEF) and the movement forecasts the Airport provides. The airlines are rapidly changing and responding to the market conditions, in

some instances changing aircraft types that service routes. There is an increased focus on efficiency, fuel burn and costs.

QPRC said there was correspondence from ASA that implied some of the bad weather was why the pilots did not utilise RNP more often. He read out a letter from WEET who is of the view that the increase in aircraft was because of weather. However, that seems not to be the case.

ASA said the increase in the poor weather would actually mean there would be less of these flights because pilots need visual with reference to the ground and they would then fly the ILS onto Runway 35. The smart tracking is to Runway 35 not Runway 30. If a visual approach is not viable, the pilots will operate on Runway 35.

ASA referred to ASA's recently announced changes to the use of existing flight paths into Canberra Airport and that from 14 July QantasLink Q400 aircraft could commence RNP-AR procedures on Runway 17/35. Turboprop aircraft operating the RNP-AR to Runway 35 would not impact the Weetalabah Estate community.

ASA said we can confirm that the weather would not direct an increase in flights over Weetalabah because it is a visual approach.

Noel confirmed there was no instrument landing approach on Runway 30.

ASA said there was the RNAV instrument approach to Runway 30 which was referenced in the communication.

5.2 Request for Noise Monitor – Weetalabah Estate Executive Committee

ASA returned to the presentation and slide 26 and 27 which showed a VOLANS model video of an aircraft measuring 61.1 dBA over Weetalabah Drive. Within reason, he was happy to run a few of these VOLANS models if that would be valuable to the community. If agreed, he suggested that the Chair should make a formal request to him to take back to the ASA team. He could not advise how long it would take to complete the modelling. It should be noted that there is no noise limit on aircraft in Australia. It is ASA's job to make sure aircraft are safe and that ASA try to minimise impacts where possible.

WEET asked how old the data was?

ASA said there was a slight lag in the data of a few weeks, but he would be happy to work with the CACG to identify a time period and also aircraft types. I will have that conversation with you and be really transparent about it.

JRA suggested running the same period in 2019 so we can compare pre-COVID with today.

WEET said we have always had planes coming over but they seem closer and therefore the noise has increased. We cannot talk with our windows open.

ASA suggested the ASA team could try and find aircraft that were closer to the ground so the Weetalabah residents could get a better representation. Perhaps a one-off modelling exercise for 2019 versus 2021 with a good spread and mix of information to make the data as real as possible.

WEET advised the complaints started in September 2021 when Spring came and people started opening their windows.

ASA said ASA could source information in relation to some of the new carriers and the changes in the fleet mix, including ATRs switching to Link Airlines.

Noel advised the ATRs use Runway 35 or 17.

WEET asked if we are still having problems with noise after the modelling has been completed, what are some potential solutions? Can we move flights in another direction over the Gorge or Kowan Forest? I am suggesting this because there are no residents in that corridor.

ASA said no matter where you put the flight path, there are communities who will be under the aircraft. All we are going to do is move the noise to another community.

ASA added that the design of flight paths by ASA is governed by the Flight Path Design Principles. These Principles ensure ASA manages the impacts of aviation activities and this requires a careful balance of ensuring safety, operational efficiency, protecting the environment in terms of fuel burn etc. and minimising the effects of aviation noise on the community, wherever practical. It is not just about moving the flight paths to places that are not populated at the moment, it is also about considerations for future land use planning with Queanbeyan-Palerang Regional Council. These are just some of the aspects ASA needs to consider when determining flight paths.

The Chair confirmed that he and Noel would be in contact with ASA regarding additional information via VOLANS modelling.

ASA thanked the CACG members for their participation and said that ASA would be happy to continue the conversation to see if ASA can provide information to the Weetalabah Estate residents through the additional VOLANS modelling exercise.

6. CANBERRA AIRPORT

6.1 Aviation Overview by Michael Thomson, Head of Aviation

Michael spoke to the Powerpoint presentation.

FPCA asked what were the post-midnight arrangements for the Qatar flight?

Michael advised Canberra Airport was still working through those arrangements with Qatar.

JRA asked what Canberra Airport expected the dBA measurement to be when the Qatar aircraft flew over the Jerrabomberra noise monitor? JRA also queried what the Airport's arrangement was with Qatar with respect to flying the RNP?

Noel advised that prior to COVID-19 Qatar was using the 777-300 and that measured approximately 75 dBA. We are still in discussions with Qatar in terms of whether it will utilise the straight-in ILS approach. We have the Noise Abatement Procedures (NAPs) in place.

JRA said the NAP has been in place since 1998 and if Qatar decides not to fly the RNP that would make a farce of that procedure.

Noel advised the Airport's priority was to ensure safe operations for all aircraft and the Runway 17 arrival was subject to tailwind and if that is more than 3 knots, the pilots prefer not to land on that runway. I also said in our conversation last Friday that we would continue to work with Qatar to get an answer for you by 1 October.

JRA said the Airport therefore had no real timeline for the Jerrabomberra community until 1 October.

Noel said that was an unfair comment as the Airport was still working with Qatar. Qatar was still working with CASA and ASA and we will be part of the evolution of what comes out of those discussions.

JRA asked when the Airport pitched for Qatar to come back, what was the process, what happened in the process about arrival times and the like?

Michael said Canberra Airport did not pitch for them to come back. We stayed in contact with them. We did not have any discussion about any arrival times. Qatar advised the Airport two weeks ago that they were coming back on 1 October and of their arrival and departure times. The arrival time is based on connectivity into and out of Doha. Getting flights into Doha from Europe and back into Australia. Our preference would be for an earlier arrival as we have to extend our airfield operations staff times and the tower has to operate extended hours, but we are a 24/7 airfield and welcome Qatar back. Qatar has advised us that this is their time.

Noel advised that for over twenty years we have been telling the Jerrabomberra community about the airport growing in capacity and operations. We have never stopped telling the community since 1999 that they have chosen to live in Jerrabomberra and other locations inside and outside the Noise Abatement Area (NAA). The public is aware that this is a 24-hour operational airport and it will get busier over time. We have agreed with the Village Building Company to include a statement in their contracts that the airport is a 24-hour, non-curfewed airport.

JRA said in the media release that has come out, and knowing our long history, I would have expected something like we are pleased to say that Qatar is flying the RNP and abiding by the 1998 noise mitigation measures. To have that written into the media release would have sent a strong message to the community, so we can get a good nights' sleep.

Michael advised it was Qatar's release not ours.

ASA advised ASA looks at ATC operations and there are still ongoing discussion around the timing of that flight as we were looking for an earlier time. Do not take the existing schedule as being settled yet. In terms of ASA operations, there are still some broader considerations in discussion at the moment. The Enhanced Regional Package is to come out. The schedule is not settled, but it will commence on 1 October.

Noel spoke to the Canberra Airport Briefing Paper covering agenda items 6.2-6.8.

7. REPORTS

7.1 Community Groups

No reports were tabled.

GCC asked if Singapore Airlines intended to return to Canberra Airport?

Michael advised that Canberra Airport was in discussions with Singapore Airlines but did not envisage them returning this year.

7.2 Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development, Communications and the Arts

DITRDCA spoke to the Meeting Brief.

In answer to a question from TCC about drone detection, particularly around the vicinity of prisons, ASA advised that ASA was undertaking drone detection work in co-operation with CASA. The intent was to have a standardised rule across the country and that was being worked through with the states and territories.

7.3 Queanbeyan-Palerang Regional Council Update

QPRC spoke to the Meeting Brief.

JRA advised the Jerrabomberra Residents Association (JRA) had a presentation from TRG in December 2021 regarding plans for a new Bushfire Response and Training Centre in Hume. JRA was concerned about more helicopter movements outside bushfire season and more particularly what was planned for the Lanyon Drive intersection as it would add further congestion to an already congested area. The people from the design team had not yet responded to JRA's concerns.

7.4 ACT Government Update

ACT Government spoke to the Meeting Brief.

ACT Government suggested that JRA go directly back to them rather than through EPSDD.

WCCC advised he had been trying to contact the TCCS Disruption Taskforce to ask various questions.

ACT Government suggested that WCCC should try Canberra Connect.

7.5 NSW Department of Planning and Environment Update

The Meeting Brief prepared by DPE was noted.

8. OTHER BUSINESS AS RAISED AT THE MEETING

No other business was raised.

9. NEXT MEETING

It was noted that the next meeting is proposed for Thursday, 1 December 2022, to be confirmed by release of agenda.

There being no other business, the Chair closed the meeting at 4.15pm.