Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates 2016 - 2017

Infrastructure and Regional Development

Committee Question Number: 120
Departmental Question Number: SQ17-000085

Program: n/a
Division/Agency: Aviation and Airports
Topic: Bankstown Airport
Proof Hansard Page: Written (28 February 2017)

Senator Burston, Brian asked:

In regards to Bankstown Airport

a) The Bankstown Airport was leased by the Commonwealth to Bankstown Airport Limited in 1998. The lease agreement contains the following provision:

"Clause 9.1

Subject to clause 9.2 the Lessee must keep and maintain the Airport Site including the Structures in good and substantial repair at all times during the Term (fair wear and tear excepted) and at the expiration or earlier determination of the term, vacate and yield up the Airport Site and the

Structures in that state of repair and condition and in accordance with the Lessee's Covenants. The Lessee accepts the full and sole responsibility for the condition, operation, repair, replacement, maintenance and management of the Airport Site including the Structures during the Term."

Despite the clarity and unambiguity of this clause, the following breaches have been allowed to occur;

i. The original 1942 "Heritage" listed building located on Airport Avenue has been allowed to fall into a state of disrepair. This was the USAF/RAAF Headquarters building in WW2 and after the war it became Headquarters of the RAAF National Service.

ii. The original Male and Female toilet block are in a state of disrepair and have inoperative toilets and can only be described as disgusting. These are the Public Toilets for the major

Secondary Airport in New South Wales and as such are a poor advertisement.

What action does the Department plan to take in relation to this clear breach of the lease agreement that the Commonwealth is a signatory to?

b) I now draw your attention to Clause 9.2 of the lease agreement.

"9.2 Maintenance of runways and pavements

The Lessee must maintain the runways, taxiways, pavements and all parts of the airport essential for the safe access by air transport to a standard at the commencement of the Lease."

This condition has clearly been violated with the use of runway 18/36 being discontinued and asbestos-contaminated landfill placed over it.

What authorisation, if any, was given for this condition of the lease to be so clearly disregarded? Please provide documentation.

c) Are you aware that leases to aviation tenants are only being offered on a three year lease basis, containing a relocation clause?

d) Do you accept that this denies a business security of tenure, and prevents them from being able to invest and carry on their business properly?

e) Are you aware that Bankstown Airport Limited has been purchased by First State Superannuation?

f) Are you aware that First State Superannuation has appointed Altis Property Partners to manage Bankstown Airport Limited?

g) Are you aware that Altis Property Partners is a property developer with no experience or specialist knowledge to run an airport?

h) What action does your department plan to take to ensure that Bankstown Airport is operated according to the lease agreement and not redeveloped for non-Aviation commercial use?

Answer:

a) Bankstown Airport Limited is undertaking a heritage review on the airport, including Building 62 (the former RAAF National Service Headquarters). Discussions between the Department and Bankstown Airport Limited in relation to the heritage value of Building 62 are ongoing.

Bankstown Airport Limited is considering the maintenance of the toilets in question, noting alternate public toilets are located a short distance away in the terminal building. The Department does not consider Bankstown Airport Limited is in breach of its lease with regard to the management of these public toilets.

b) The closure of runway 18/36 was approved in 2005 by the then Minister for Transport and Regional Services as part of the 2004 Bankstown Airport Master Plan on the basis that the runway was used infrequently. The general aviation community at Bankstown Airport was consulted and this issue generated minimal interest or objection. During the 2004 Master Plan process, only seven submissions raised the issue, and only two of these submissions were from aviation industry operators.

The closure of runway 18/36 does not constitute a breach of the terms of the Airport Lease.

c) Sublease arrangements on Bankstown Airport are commercial matters managed by Bankstown Airport Limited.

d) Sublease arrangements on Bankstown Airport are commercial matters managed by Bankstown Airport Limited.

e) The Department is aware of First State Superannuation's relationship with BAC Holdco Pty Ltd, the company that owns 100% of Bankstown Airport Limited.

f) The Department is aware of the relationship between Altis Property Partners and BAC Holdco Pty Ltd. Management of Bankstown Airport remains the responsibility of Bankstown Airport Limited, the Airport Lessee Company.

g) Day to day management of Bankstown Airport continues to be undertaken by the Airport Lessee Company, Bankstown Airport Limited.

h) The Department undertakes an annual lease and compliance review with all federally leased airports.

All development of the airport site is undertaken in accordance with the approved Bankstown Airport Master Plan and the *Airports Act 1996*.

Bankstown Airport Limited continues to provide for the use of the airport site as an airport.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates 2016 - 2017

Infrastructure and Regional Development

Committee Question Number: 121
Departmental Question Number: SQ17-000088

Program: Aviation & Airports
Division/Agency: Airservices Australia
Topic: Australian Noise Exposure Index (ANEI) for Melbourne Airport
Proof Hansard Page: 134 (27 February 2017)

Senator Rice, Janet asked:

Senator RICE: Has there been consideration of requiring an ANEI for Melbourne Airport?
Mr Mrdak: I would have to take that on notice. I do not recall.

Answer:

An ANEI features in Chapter 12 of the current 2013 Melbourne Airport Master Plan.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates 2016 - 2017

Infrastructure and Regional Development

Committee Question Number: 122
Departmental Question Number: SQ17-000100

Program: n/a
Division/Agency: Aviation and Airports
Topic: Sydney Airport Community Forum Membership
Proof Hansard Page: 95 (27 February 2017)

Senator Cameron, Doug asked:

Senator CAMERON: How many members of parliament are on the Sydney one? What is the Sydney oversight called?
Mr McRandle: SACF.
Mr Mrdak: Sydney airport community forum.
Senator CAMERON: SACF?
Mr McRandle: SACF.
Senator CAMERON: How many members of parliament are on that?
Mr Mrdak: I would have to check. I do not have that detail with them. It is a range of federal, state and local government representatives.

Answer:

Membership of the Sydney Airport Community Forum currently includes 11 Federal Members of Parliament, two New South Wales State Members of Parliament and two local government representatives.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates 2016 - 2017

Infrastructure and Regional Development

Committee Question Number: 123
Departmental Question Number: SQ17-000106

Program: n/a
Division/Agency: Aviation and Airports
Topic: Airport Categorisation
Proof Hansard Page: 94 (27 February 2017)

Senator Cameron, Doug asked:

Mr Mrdak: Regional has a specific definition under aviation bilateral agreements. So if we are talking about that, we are talking about something quite different to how we treat a greater urban area.
Senator CAMERON: Could you provide me, then, the definition of regional and international?
Mr Mrdak: Certainly.
Senator CAMERON: And provide me with details of how the different classifications operate?
Mr Mrdak: As I said, the classification of international is based on the provision of customs immigration and border security controls.

Answer:

Airports are classified in different ways for different purposes.

International airports are those designated as such by the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport in accordance with Section 9 of the *Air Navigation Act 1920* (Cth). Designated international airports are categorised according to the level of customs, immigration and border security controls that are available. An airport's category determines the nature of international flights that may be operated there, such as scheduled and non-scheduled flights (Attachment A).

Separately, Australia's bilateral air services arrangements with other countries provide the framework for international flights to take place. The arrangements set out the commercial entitlements that airlines can utilise when operating flights to and from Australia. Each arrangement, including any amendments to the arrangement, must be negotiated by Australia with its respective bilateral partner.

The arrangements generally stipulate the maximum amount of capacity that can be operated to and from Sydney, Melbourne, Brisbane and Perth. Outside of these four 'major' gateways, many of Australia's arrangements allow airlines to operate an unlimited number of international flights to Australia's other international airports, referred to as 'regional' gateways. A decision on an airport's gateway status – either major or regional – for the purposes of bilateral air services arrangements is made by Government on a case by case basis and in consultation with relevant stakeholders.

Attachments

- Attachment A – Categories of airports

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates 2016 - 2017

Infrastructure and Regional Development

Attachment A

The categories of airports are:

- **Major International**
  Airports of entry and departure where all formalities incident to Customs, Immigration, Health and similar procedures are carried out, and which are open to scheduled and non-scheduled flights.
- **Restricted Use International**
  Airports of entry and departure at which the formalities incident to Customs, Immigration, Health and similar procedures are made available on a restricted basis, to flights with prior approval only.
- **Alternate International**
  Airports specified in the flight plan to which a flight may proceed when it becomes inadvisable to land at the airport of intended landing.
- **International Non-Scheduled Flight**
  Airports at which approval may be granted, provided the prescribed prior notice is given, for international non-scheduled flights only; no other form of international operation is permitted.
- **External Territory International**
  Airports of entry and departure for international air traffic located upon an Australian External Territory, where all formalities incident to Customs, Immigration, Health and similar procedures are available.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates 2016 - 2017

Infrastructure and Regional Development

Committee Question Number: 124
Departmental Question Number: SQ17-000026

Program: n/a
Division/Agency: Aviation and Airports
Topic: International air services to Hobart Airport
Proof Hansard Page: 51 (27 February 2017)

Senator Urquhart, Anne asked:

Senator URQUHART: Hobart airport also indicated that flights between the airport and New Zealand might be possible. Has the possibility of those progressed any further?
Mr Mrdak: Not to my knowledge. I will take that on notice. I presume that those conversations are continuing with various airlines.

Answer:

Discussions on prospective international air services are a commercial matter for Hobart Airport to progress with relevant airlines and do not directly involve the Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates 2016 - 2017

Infrastructure and Regional Development

Committee Question Number: 125
Departmental Question Number: SQ17-000144

Program: 2.4 Air Transport
Division/Agency: Aviation and Airports
Topic: Aviation training
Proof Hansard Page: Written (14 March 2017)

Senator Rice, Janet asked:

What action is proposed in order to ensure the aviation training companies in Australia quickly introduce the quieter-generation training aircraft, the same way airlines operating scheduled commercial flights have done over the past 20 years?

Answer:

Fleet management and replacement is a matter for flying training operators, however, all aircraft operating in Australia are required to meet noise standards specified in the Air Navigation (Aircraft Noise) Regulations 1984.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates 2016 - 2017

Infrastructure and Regional Development

Committee Question Number: 126
Departmental Question Number: SQ17-000145

Program: n/a
Division/Agency: Aviation and Airports
Topic: Avalon Airport
Proof Hansard Page: Written (14 March 2017)

Senator Rice, Janet asked:

1) Has the Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development given consideration to making use of runway capacity at Avalon Airport to meet growing aviation demand in the Melbourne metropolitan area? If not, what prohibits this consideration?

2) I understand that, as an asset acquired from the Department of Defence through a long term year lease agreement, Avalon Airport is not subject to the provisions of the Airports Act 1996. Given that, what does this mean for integrated planning for aviation across metropolitan Melbourne?

3) What is the government's view on whether Avalon Airport should be treated the same as other federally leased airports?

Answer:

1) The Department acknowledges the important role that Avalon Airport plays in meeting the aviation requirements of Geelong and the wider Melbourne region.

   The Department does not manage the distribution of traffic between airports in the Melbourne metropolitan area. Airlines are able to negotiate directly with airports, including Avalon Airport, for use of that airport's facilities.

2) The Department works cooperatively with the Victorian Government and the Department of Defence, and the government agencies with primary responsibility for planning relating to Avalon Airport, to ensure the future development of the Airport is consistent with broader aviation planning in the wider Melbourne region.

   The Department of Defence is responsible for assessing and approving the Avalon Airport Master Plan, and this Department and the Victorian Government are part of the formal consultation process regarding the Master Plan.

3) The Department of Defence approach is consistent with the *Airports Act 1996* and aviation safety and security requirements apply

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates 2016 - 2017

Infrastructure and Regional Development

Committee Question Number: 127
Departmental Question Number: SQ17-000148

Program: 2.4 Air Transport
Division/Agency: Aviation and Airports
Topic: Aircraft Noise certification
Proof Hansard Page: Written (14 March 2017)

Senator Rice, Janet asked:

Have the levels of the noise limits required at certification of aircraft changed over time and if yes, is there any requirement for previously certified aircraft to be modified to meet new noise limits?

How many aircraft, or what proportion, were approved for operation in Australia at less stringent noise limits than currently apply?

Answer:

Aircraft noise certification requirements have become more stringent over time in line with international standards agreed by the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO).

These requirements have generally been placed on new aircraft types and designs when aircraft enter service rather than placed on already certified aircraft.

A new noise standard will apply to jet aircraft greater than 55,000kgs registered to operate from 1 January 2018.

For small propeller driven aircraft (less than 8,168kgs) there are two noise standards which apply, ICAO Chapter 6 standard for aircraft manufactured prior to 17 November 1988 and ICAO Chapter 10 standard for aircraft manufactured after 17 November 1988. Any new versions of propeller driven aircraft would need to be certified at the post 17 November 1988 standard.

There are over 15,000 aircraft registered for operations in Australia. All aircraft meet the current noise standards with the exception of:

- Adventure flight aircraft of historical significance manufactured prior to 1977;
- Historic aircraft with single pilot operators manufactured prior to 1977;
- Aircraft used exclusively for agricultural (fertilising, disease and pest control), firefighting (specialist designed firefighting aircraft) or acrobatic displays;
- Aircraft used in environmental operations (pollution clean-up) or
- Aircraft in the public interest (e.g. specialist surveillance aircraft, specialist freight aircraft, medical supplies to remote locations, scientific research etc).

These exceptions would account for less than 2 per cent of the 15,000 registered aircraft.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates 2016 - 2017

Infrastructure and Regional Development

Committee Question Number: 128
Departmental Question Number: SQ17-000149

Program: 2.4 Air Transport
Division/Agency: Aviation and Airports
Topic: Aircraft noise standard
Proof Hansard Page: Written (14 March 2017)

Senator Rice, Janet asked:

Why is there not an aircraft in flight noise standard given that various pieces of local and state government legislation exist to set standards for noise in all other situations that impact communities and the human and natural environment , ie neighbourhood noise, animal noise, industrial situation noise, motor vehicle and motor bike noise etc?

Mr Mrdak stated (p 131 of the Hansard) "if we find at a particular location that there is an aircraft type or a type of operation that is providing annoyance to the community, then we can start to work with that operator to see if there are different modes of operation or different operating paths." Please list instances, over the last five years, in which such changes have been implemented and indicate the nature of the new modes of operation or paths resulting from this.

Answer:

Aircraft noise standards are set by the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) for all aircraft used in civilian operations. The noise standards are defined in the International Convention on Civil Aviation, Annex 16, Volume I, Environmental Protection.

These standards are adopted in Australian legislation through the Air Navigation (Aircraft Noise) Regulations 1984 (the Aircraft Noise Regulations). The Aircraft Noise Regulations specify that all aircraft operating in Australia must comply with the applicable noise standard or for aircraft where there is no applicable noise standard apply for an exemption. The noise levels of aircraft are certified during the aircraft production process carried out in accordance with procedures specified by ICAO.

Examples of where new arrangements have been trialled in response to community concerns include:

- June 2012 – Gold Coast departure trial.

  The trial provided an opportunity to successfully reduce aircraft movements over the central area of Fingal Head. The number of flights directly over this area was reduced by 54 per cent. This reduction was despite an increase in overall aircraft movements.

- February 2016 – Roleystone arrival flight path trial.

  Airservices worked closely with the Aircraft Noise Ombudsman to identify potential noise improvement opportunities at Perth. Following consultation with the Perth Airport Community Aviation Consultation Group and Aircraft Noise Management Consultative Committee community forums, Airservices undertook a 12-month trial of a modified flight path designed to reduce aircraft noise for some suburbs to the southeast of the city. Community feedback demonstrates there was a noticeable benefit from the trial and that the change should become permanently implemented.

- February 2016 – Brisbane Runway 19 southern departures.

  A change was made in November 2014 to Brisbane Airport's Runway 19 southern jet departure flight path to reduce the noise impact for the Pinkenba community as part of Airservices' noise improvement plan.

  The flight path was to be extended 500m further on runway heading so that aircraft would remain clear of the residential area of Pinkenba and move slightly further towards the motorway south of the airport before re-joining the original flight path just prior to Tingalpa.

  Pinkenba overflight was a consistent issue for the community for a number of years and this change was a solution proposed by the Community Representative at the Brisbane Community Aviation Consultation Group (CACG).

- February 2016 – Canberra Airport Runway 35 South and West (Jet) Departure Flight Path Amendment.

  In 2014 at the request of Canberra Airport, Airservices changed a flight path for aircraft departing from Runway 35 on the Standard Instrument Departure at Canberra Airport in order to reduce the noise impact for residents living in the north-west of Canberra such as Gungahlin.

  This change was suggested by Canberra Airport and the CACG has shown strong support.

- March 2016 – Gold Coast RNP Post implementation review.

  Smart Tracking has been successfully used by some aircraft landing on Runway 14 at Gold Coast Airport since 2008. In November 2014, Airservices implemented Smart Tracking technology permanently for all suitably equipped aircraft landing on Runway 14 at Gold Coast Airport.

  The Gold Coast Airport community forums have shown strong support for Smart Tracking technology to be available for all suitably equipped aircraft.

- January 2017 – Perth Smart Tracking.

  The Smart Tracking flight path to Runway 03 was introduced in Perth on 17 September 2015.

  The Smart Tracking flight path is available to all suitably equipped aircraft arriving from the north and east landing onto Runway 03 (southern end of the main runway). The arrival flight path corridor connected to the Smart Tracking approach is located to the east of residential areas in the Perth Hills.

  The previous arrival flight path from the north in the same general location was moved to follow the new arrival flight path corridor. This means that the majority of arrivals to Runway 03 from the north, whether using Smart Tracking or not, will fly the same path.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates 2016 - 2017

Infrastructure and Regional Development

Committee Question Number: 129
Departmental Question Number: SQ17-000150

Program: 2.4 Air Transport
Division/Agency: Aviation and Airports
Topic: Aircraft noise at secondary airports
Proof Hansard Page: Written (15 March 2017)

Senator Rice, Janet asked:

With reference to secondary airports listed at http://www.airservicesaustralia.com/aircraftnoise/secondary-airport-information/

1) Is there merit in handing back noise management at secondary airports such as Archerfield, Bankstown, Jandakot, Moorabbin and Parafield to the EPA in each state?

2) What other strategies does Airservices have to reduce aircraft noise levels to acceptable public standards? This includes helicopters.

3) Regarding ANEFs:

a) How are ANEFs calculated at secondary airports?

b) Are there noise monitors used at those airports?

c) Is the noise caused by individual aircraft is taken into account?

d) How are they calculated when actual flight paths are not known or used?

4) As an interim step, what is Airservices' view on a proposed phase in of restrictions on aircraft which are more than eight (8) years old and are also in the top 10 noisiest aircraft, at each of the secondary airports, factoring in forewarning to owners?

5) Can Airservices look at the situation at Jandakot Airport regarding the Singapore Flying College and the continued use of the twin-engine Beechcraft Baron?

a) Is this an example of why the noise issue is perpetuated at secondary airports?

b) What is Airservices' opinion of the poor voluntary take up of quieter aircraft by training operators at secondary airports, given such decisions are being taken even by Singapore Airlines, a major international airline?

Answer:

1) Airservices Australia (Airservices) is able to provide nationally consistent advice on noise management at these airports and works in consultation with the independent Aircraft Noise Ombudsman who makes recommendations to improve complaints handling and aircraft noise management by Airservices.

2) Airservices seeks to minimise, and where possible, reduce the impact of aircraft noise through:

- work in investigating aircraft noise complaints and working with aircraft operators to safely conduct their aircraft operations in ways that minimise noise impacts;
- proactive community engagement, consultation and information sharing;
- collaborative stakeholder engagement within the aviation industry;
- alignment of actions and processes with the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) Balanced Approach to Noise Management protocol;
- innovation and technology development within Airservices and across the industry; and
- independent validations and international benchmarking of our processes and actions.

Further information on Airservices aircraft noise management strategies can be found at: www.airservicesaustralia.com/wp-content/uploads/Aircraft_Noise_Management-WEB.pdf

3) a. ANEFs at secondary airports are calculated using the same software and methodologies used at major airports around the country. Calculation of the ANEF metric is defined in the Australian Standard 2021:2015 Acoustics – Aircraft Noise Intrusion – Building Siting and Construction.

The ANEF computation is based on forecasts of air traffic movements on an average day. Movements are generally categorised by:

- time of day (day or night);
- type of aircraft;
- operation type (take-off, landing or circuit);
- range/route;
- runway used; and
- flight path.

b. Airservices has a Noise and Flight Path Monitoring System that does not have permanent noise monitoring setup at secondary airports, however a program of Short Term Noise Monitoring of periods from three to 12 months has been used at various secondary airports around the country.

c. Aircraft types are considered in calculation of an ANEF, not individual aircraft. Note that the ANEF is a forecast of movements, generally for 20 years into the future. The Australian Noise Exposure Index (ANEI) provides a better description of historic noise impacts. The ANEI is a contour map based on historical data from a previous year, where exact numbers and types of aircraft which used the airport are known.

d. An ANEF cannot be generated without flight path information. Aircraft flight paths are used in the generation of each ANEF. To determine accurate flight paths, ANEFs are generally based on:

- historic RADAR data;
- input from air traffic control; and
- input from aircraft operators.

4) The Australian Government would be concerned over the imposition of costly arbitrary restrictions on aircraft operations. As required under the ICAO Balanced Approach to Aircraft Noise Management any operating restrictions should be explored in a coherent and objective manner with respect to the basic principles of transparency, cost-effectiveness, non-discrimination, and with due consideration of possible market distortion.

5) a. and b.

Airservices will discuss the use of the twin-engine Beechcraft Baron with the Singapore Flying College to determine if there are noise mitigation measures that the College is prepared to adopt.

Noise issues at secondary airports are generally the result of continuous overflight by single engine fixed wing aircraft whilst training and/or helicopter activity. Twin-engine aircraft are generally not the aircraft used for repetitive circuit training and complaint data does not indicate that twin-engine aircraft form more of the complaint data from secondary airports.

Airservices encourages the establishment of fly neighbourly agreements, which are voluntary codes of practice that seek to reduce the disturbance caused by aircraft within a particular area. Airservices has worked closely with Jandakot Airport and operators including Singapore Flying College to develop a best practice fly neighbourly agreement for the airport.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates 2016 - 2017

Infrastructure and Regional Development

Committee Question Number: 130
Departmental Question Number: SQ17-000151

Program: 2.4 Air Transport
Division/Agency: Aviation and Airports
Topic: Aircraft noise monitoring at secondary airports
Proof Hansard Page: Written (15 March 2017)

Senator Rice, Janet asked:

1) Can Airservices report back on the location of noise monitors for Jandakot Airport and extend this to include secondary airports including Archerfield, Bankstown, Moorabbin, Parafield and also Sunshine Coast (helicopters). (Ref p 130 and 131 of the Hansard from the RRAT estimates hearing)
2) Will Airservices install permanent noise monitors in proximity to secondary airports including Archerfield, Bankstown, Moorabbin, Parafield and also Sunshine Coast, if the current locations prove to lack reasonable information?
3) Can Airservices locate the new permanent monitors under the flight paths with heaviest concentration? If not, why not?
4) Is there consultation with the public when determining locations for permanent noise monitors? If not, why not?
5) Can movements by each aircraft be counted on the monitors and audited (i.e. to prevent aircraft taking unusual flight paths with the effect of avoiding the monitors unreasonably)?
6) Can the "spike" idea be accommodated for noise events that exceed a noise limit? (ref p 132 of the Hansard).
7) Helicopters doing pilot training are claimed to have readings from 75dBA to 85dBA near Jandakot Airport and some vibrate windows. There is also a claim the noise is accentuated by low altitude, sharp banked turns and rotor slap. How is this type of noise monitored and responded to?

Answer:

1) Short Term Noise Monitoring was performed at Jandakot Airport for a period of six months (February to August) in 2016. Noise monitors were placed in the suburbs of Bibra Lake, Canning Vale, Jandakot and Piara Lakes.

   Other secondary airports where short term noise monitoring has been conducted include Moorabbin Airport (VIC) and Parafield Airport (SA). At this stage there is no requirement to undertake noise monitoring at secondary airports, however short term noise monitoring may be undertaken on a case-by-case basis where major changes are proposed. For example, noise monitoring is in place at Sunshine Coast Airport to collect data relevant to a proposed runway extension.

2) There is no current intention to undertake noise monitoring at secondary airports, however short term noise monitoring may be undertaken on a case-by-case basis where major changes are proposed. Permanent noise monitors are situated in locations that comply with International Standard *ISO20906 Acoustics – Unattended monitoring of aircraft sound in the vicinity of airports* and additional criteria set down by Airservices.

3) See Answer to Question 2.

4) Yes, the location of noise monitors is discussed at Community Aviation Consultation Group meetings.

5) Where reliable RADAR and flight plan data exists, noise events measured by the noise monitors are correlated with aircraft flight paths to form a correlated noise event. It is possible to determine to the distance each aircraft travels in relation to the noise monitor.

6) As indicated at the Estimates Hearings, there is no "spike" in terms of noise levels and noise monitoring is not undertaken to determine compliance with an exceedance noise limit. As indicated above where reliable RADAR and flight plan data exists, it is possible to form correlated noise events attributed to individual aircraft. In the case of secondary airports, individual aircraft type information and aircraft registration details are not always available.

7) At Jandakot Airport, short term noise monitors were put in place for a period of six months in 2016. During this time, each noise monitor was generally in operation 24/7, collecting noise data. Noise events are reported in terms of a maximum noise level and not differentiated to specific helicopter characteristics of low altitude, sharp banked turns and rotor slap.

Further information on the short term noise monitoring program conducted at Jandakot Airport can be found at: www.airservicesaustralia.com/wp-content/uploads/Short-Term-Monitoring-Program-Jandakot-WA-February-2017-V3.pdf.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates 2016 - 2017

Infrastructure and Regional Development

Committee Question Number: 131
Departmental Question Number: SQ17-000152

Program: 2.4 Air Transport
Division/Agency: Aviation and Airports
Topic: Aircraft transponders
Proof Hansard Page: Written (15 March 2017)

Senator Rice, Janet asked:

1) With regard to information on aircraft (training aircraft and helicopters included) being detected on WebTrak - are transponders checked regularly to ensure they are functioning? For example, are pilots including this in the pre-start inspection?
2) Can an audit be conducted, and a report published, to determine what percentage of aircraft based at secondary airports, including Archerfield, Bankstown, Moorabbin, Parafield and also Sunshine Coast:
a) have transponders fitted and
b) are fully functional

Answer:

1) Mode S transponders (capable of transmitting flight identification, in addition to altitude and speed) are not mandatory for aircraft operating under Visual Flight Rules less than 5,700kgs at less than 10,000ft.

   Aircraft operating in controlled airspace and/or under Instrument Flight Rules are required to be fitted with a transponder. Transponders are required to be tested before use and checking/recalibration every two years.

   Pilots are not able to check transponder functioning in pre-start inspections but at a controlled aerodrome, and prior to take-off, air traffic control (ATC) requires a pilot to turn the transponder on and select a four digit code assigned to ATC to determine if a signal is detected.

   It is also the case that for aircraft where transponders are required, not all of these aircraft will be displayed in WebTrak. Some aircraft are excluded from WebTrak for operational (e.g. security) reasons.

2) Not applicable as at these airports transponders are not required for all aircraft.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates 2016 - 2017

Infrastructure and Regional Development

Committee Question Number: 132
Departmental Question Number: SQ17-000068

Program: 2.4 Air Transport
Division/Agency: Aviation and Airports
Topic: Aircraft Noise Insulation Programmes
Proof Hansard Page: Written (15 March 2017)

Senator Rice, Janet asked:

1) I understand a house insulation program was available for residents nearby Sydney and Adelaide airports. What were the noise level criteria for each of those projects, in order to determine a home qualified for the noise treatment?
2) Was helicopter noise considered a factor in these noise impact assessments?
3) Has noise insulation been considered for residents near secondary airports if, as prima facie evidence indicates, the situation is as bad (as Sydney and Adelaide) for these residents in the secondary airport noise footprints? If not, why not?
4) What was the overall cost of the noise insulation program, both per house and overall?
5) Was there consideration of cost recovery from the companies that cause the aircraft engine noise?
6) What noise amelioration programs or approaches can Airservices suggest as an alternative to noise insulation for buildings?

Answer:

1) Eligibility for previous noise insulation programmes at Sydney and Adelaide was based on aircraft noise exposure calculated using the Australian Noise Exposure Index (ANEI). Residential properties within the 30 ANEI contour and public buildings within the 25 ANEI contour were eligible for assistance under the programme. The ANEI is based on inputs including the number and type of aircraft operating (including helicopters), their flight paths and noise characteristics, and the time of day of their operation.

2) Yes.

3) No. Australia seeks to manage aircraft noise using the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) Balanced Approach to Noise Management. See answer to Question 6 for more details.

4) The total cost of the Sydney programme was $421.2 million and for the Adelaide programme $60.5 million. An average cost of insulation per house is not meaningful as the total programme cost includes a mix of building types insulated (houses, schools, churches, nursing homes, etc.) and some house acquisitions.

5) Yes. Costs for the programmes were recovered through levies applied to jet aircraft landings at Sydney and Adelaide Airports. The levies were payable by the aircraft operator on a per aircraft basis and the amount payable reflected the noise characteristics of the aircraft involved.

6) Australia has adopted the ICAO Balanced Approach to Noise Management (the balanced approach). Measures available under the balanced approach include:

- Reducing aircraft noise at its source by requiring aircraft to comply with internationally agreed noise certification standards and progressively introducing new standards for quieter aircraft;
- Noise abatement procedures aimed at reducing or redistributing noise around airports by directing aircraft over less densely populated areas or over water, and defining noise abatement areas to protect noise sensitive communities from overflight where possible;
- Land-use planning and management to prevent new noise sensitive developments near airports; and
- Operating restrictions that limit or reduce aircraft access to an airport through movement caps, noise quotas or curfews.