

Question on notice no. 132

Portfolio question number: SQ24-001331

2024-25 Supplementary budget estimates

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Committee, Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development, Communications and the Arts Portfolio

Senator Steph Hodgins-May: asked the Airservices Australia on 14 November 2024

(1.Noise Action Plan for Brisbane changes currently being considered by Airservices involve adjusting the arrival flight paths for both runways. TRAX suggested that for the new runway (01L) , arrival paths would shift slightly south by about 1-2 km, to overcome some flyability issues experienced during adverse weather conditions. For the legacy runway (01R) , the arrival paths would move 4-5 km further south to maintain safe horizontal and vertical separation from aircraft landing on the new runway whilst allowing aircraft enough time to align with the Instrument Landing System before starting their final approach. To keep aircraft safely separated, will those landing on the legacy runway fly 1,000 feet lower than those landing on the new runway?

a.Have those communities newly to be affected by aircraft noise pollution been notified of these proposed changes?

b.Have any engagement sessions been held in those new locations?

2.The Design Concepts in Sets 1 and 2 of the Phase 5 engagement aim to reduce the concentration of flights to the west of the airport. This concerns the high concentration and frequency of flights affecting areas to the west of the airport, which is partly due to the close proximity of the SMOKA arrival path (serving inbound traffic from the north and west) and the WACKO departure path (serving outbound traffic in the same directions) . Airservices are investigating the possibility of repositioning the enroute waypoints (SMOKA and WACKO) . Where will these waypoints be located in the future and what new communities will be impacted as a result of these changes?

a.Have those communities newly affected by aircraft noise pollution been notified of these proposed changes?

b.Have any engagement sessions been held in those new locations?

3.Is it correct that the only proposition on the table as part of the Noise Action Plan for Brisbane is noise sharing and no net noise reductions being planned?

a.Some of the proposed flight path changes continue to use the same airspace over the same communities. How will this create any true noise reduction if the same communities continue to be overflowed all the time?

4.Why did Airservices prioritise Redlands and bayside communities for relief when communities in some 220+ other suburbs suffering night time departures over land are still waiting?

5.When are Brisbane communities going to get an airspace design and management plan that prevents them from being overflowed by both departures and arrivals as originally promised in the 2007 MDP/EIS?

6.The Noise Preferential Routes flight path design has forced General Aviation

(GA) lower from originally 1000 feet over many Brisbane suburbs. Why are Airservices not taking into account GA when designing flight paths, especially over communities such as Samford and Brookfield who rely on tank water?

Answer —

Please find answer attached

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport

QUESTION ON NOTICE

Supplementary Budget Estimates 2024 - 2025

Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development, Communications and the Arts

Committee Question Number: 132

Departmental Question Number: SQ24-001331

Division/Agency Name: Agency - Airservices Australia

Hansard Reference: Written (14 November 2024)

Topic: AIRSERVICES - Noise Action Plan for Brisbane

Senator Steph Hodgins-May asked:

1. Noise Action Plan for Brisbane changes currently being considered by Airservices involve adjusting the arrival flight paths for both runways. TRAX suggested that for the new runway (01L), arrival paths would shift slightly south by about 1-2 km, to overcome some flyability issues experienced during adverse weather conditions. For the legacy runway (01R), the arrival paths would move 4-5 km further south to maintain safe horizontal and vertical separation from aircraft landing on the new runway whilst allowing aircraft enough time to align with the Instrument Landing System before starting their final approach. To keep aircraft safely separated, will those landing on the legacy runway fly 1,000 feet lower than those landing on the new runway?
 - a. Have those communities newly to be affected by aircraft noise pollution been notified of these proposed changes?
 - b. Have any engagement sessions been held in those new locations?
2. The Design Concepts in Sets 1 and 2 of the Phase 5 engagement aim to reduce the concentration of flights to the west of the airport. This concerns the high concentration and frequency of flights affecting areas to the west of the airport, which is partly due to the close proximity of the SMOKA arrival path (serving inbound traffic from the north and west) and the WACKO departure path (serving outbound traffic in the same directions). Airservices are investigating the possibility of repositioning the enroute waypoints (SMOKA and WACKO). Where will these waypoints be located in the future and what new communities will be impacted as a result of these changes?
 - a. Have those communities newly affected by aircraft noise pollution been notified of these proposed changes?
 - b. Have any engagement sessions been held in those new locations?
3. Is it correct that the only proposition on the table as part of the Noise Action Plan for Brisbane is noise sharing and no net noise reductions being planned?
 - a. Some of the proposed flight path changes continue to use the same airspace over the same communities. How will this create any true noise reduction if the same communities continue to be overflown all the time?
4. Why did Airservices prioritise Redlands and bayside communities for relief when communities in some 220+ other suburbs suffering night time departures over land are still waiting?

5. When are Brisbane communities going to get an airspace design and management plan that prevents them from being overflowed by both departures and arrivals as originally promised in the 2007 MDP/EIS?
6. The Noise Preferential Routes flight path design has forced General Aviation (GA) lower from originally 1000 feet over many Brisbane suburbs. Why are Airservices not taking into account GA when designing flight paths, especially over communities such as Samford and Brookfield who rely on tank water?

Answer:

1. Yes.
 - a. communities potentially subject to these changes were included in community engagement activities across greater Brisbane which included a letterbox drop, newspaper advertising and targeted social media advertising.
 - b. 6 in-person and seven online engagement sessions were held during August and September 2024, which were open to community members from any location.
2. The potential to gain a noise improvement from relocating some waypoints is being investigated. At this time, a specific location for potential relocation has not been identified and as such Airservices does not yet know the communities that might be subject to this potential change.
3. Increasing use of Simultaneous Opposite Direction Parallel Runway Operations (SODPROPS) offers the opportunity for net noise reduction.
 - a. Package 3 of the Noise Action Plan for Brisbane focuses on changes within the constraints of the existing airspace. This package aims to identify opportunities for improvements that can be implemented in a much shorter timeframe than Package 4 which is investigating improvement opportunities across the wider airspace operations. Package 3 can offer potential noise reductions for communities subject to the more frequent or concentrated operations, by sharing these operations with other communities.
4. The flight path changes introduced on 28 November 2024, which result in communities in the Redlands area being overflowed at a much higher altitude, were required to enable greater use of SODPROPS. The changes introduced the same flight paths for use in SODPROPS mode and in northerly wind parallel operating conditions (departures over water), reducing transition time in and out of SODPROPS and increasing its use. They also reduced the impact on the Redlands community, which is overflowed when in SODPROPS mode.

By increasing our ability to operate in SODPROPS mode, communities affected by night-time overland departures receive less of these operations.
5. The proposed flight path change concepts presented to the community in August and September 2024, focus on reducing the concentration of aircraft movements on the most affected Brisbane suburbs, including locations subject to both arrivals and departures. Preferred designs resulting from this engagement will be presented to the community in mid-2025, after which a decision will be made on their implementation.

6. Select portions of the airspace around Brisbane Airport were lowered by 1000ft to accommodate the new parallel runway operations. The airspace at the point at which aircraft join the runway aligned Instrument Landing System approach to both runways (over land and over water) was lowered from 3500ft to 2500ft. At this point, aircraft are at 3000ft on approach to the legacy runway and 4000ft on approach to the new runway. This airspace designation keeps General Aviation and commercial aircraft safely separated from each other.

The lowered airspace over land, is over an area bordered by Greenbank, Beenleigh, Forest Lake and Bellbowrie/Moggill. The area of lowered airspace does not extend to Brookfield or Samford, noting Brookfield has always had a 2500ft airspace ceiling (dating back as far as 2011). GA aircraft are permitted to fly at any altitude beneath the controlled airspace ceiling but must maintain a minimum altitude of 1000ft above ground level in built up areas.