

**Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**  
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE  
Budget Estimates 2017 - 2018  
**Infrastructure and Regional Development**

**Committee Question Number:** 91  
**Departmental Question Number:** SQ17-000240

**Program:** 2.4 Air Transport  
**Division/Agency:** Aviation and Airports  
**Topic:** Hobart Airport International Air Services  
**Proof Hansard Page:** 70 (23 May 2017)

**Senator Urquhart, Anne asked:**

**Senator URQUHART:** Turning to the Hobart airport runway extension, has the government and the minister for tourism progressed discussions about securing direct international flights from the Hobart airport?

**Mr Mrdak:** We understand discussions have been held with a number of international airlines. I will ask Ms Spence to give you an update.

**Ms Spence:** The airport are actually in negotiations with international carriers. We understand they have been progressing well, but we do not have any firm details.

**Answer:**

The Department understands talks were held between Hobart International Airport Pty Ltd (HIAPL) and several major international airlines in February 2017. The outcomes, if any, of these and any other discussions are a commercial matter between HIAPL and the relevant airlines.

**Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**  
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE  
Budget Estimates 2017 - 2018  
**Infrastructure and Regional Development**

**Committee Question Number:** 92  
**Departmental Question Number:** SQ17-000241

**Program:** 2.4 Air Transport  
**Division/Agency:** Aviation and Airports  
**Topic:** Hobart Airport – direct flights to China  
**Proof Hansard Page:** 70-71 (23 May 2017)

**Senator Urquhart, Anne asked:**

**Senator URQUHART:** I understand that Hobart airport indicated that flights between the airport and China may be possible. Has the possibility of those flights been progressed that you are aware of?

**Mr Mrdak:** I think there has been an announcement in relation to some progressive talks in relation to freight, particularly of fresh milk.

**Ms Spence:** That is right.

**Mr Mrdak:** We can get an update for you in relation to that, on notice.

**Answer:**

Qantas Freight announced in November 2016 that it intends to commence a dedicated freight service from Hobart to Ningbo, China in 2017. Details of the arrangement are a commercial matter between Hobart International Airport Pty Ltd and Qantas.

**Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**  
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE  
Budget Estimates 2017 - 2018  
**Infrastructure and Regional Development**

**Committee Question Number:** 93  
**Departmental Question Number:** SQ17-000242

**Program:** 2.4 Air Transport  
**Division/Agency:** Aviation and Airports  
**Topic:** Hobart Airport – direct services to New Zealand  
**Proof Hansard Page:** 71 (23 May 2017)

**Senator Urquhart, Anne asked:**

**Senator URQUHART:** That would be great. Also, Hobart airport has indicated that flights between Hobart and New Zealand may be possible. Do you know if the possibility of those flights has been progressed?

**Ms Spence:** Again, I understand there have been discussions, but I am not aware of where those discussions have concluded.

**Answer:**

The Department understands Hobart International Airport Pty Ltd (HIAPL) has had discussions with airlines regarding direct flights to New Zealand, but is not aware of the status or content of those discussions. The outcome, if any, is a commercial matter for HIAPL and the relevant airlines.

**Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**  
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE  
Budget Estimates 2017 - 2018  
**Infrastructure and Regional Development**

**Committee Question Number:** 94  
**Departmental Question Number:** SQ17-000243

**Program:** 2.4 Air Transport  
**Division/Agency:** Aviation and Airports  
**Topic:** Dryandra Road underpass at Brisbane Airport  
**Proof Hansard Page:** 19-20 (23 May 2017)

**Senator Rice, Janet asked:**

**Senator RICE:** That is right. In fact, compared with the usual things that we discuss in this area, it is important but not a core issue, and it is about cycling access at Brisbane Airport.

**Unidentified speaker:** Cycling?

**Senator RICE:** Yes. You are surprised by that? I want to know whether you are aware of Brisbane Airport Corporation's plan which has changed safe bicycle and pedestrian access to workplaces under the general aviation area.

**Ms Horrocks:** We have some details on the cycling plans right across the Brisbane Airport. They have quite a significant strategy that I understand is in place. The recent issue in regard to access to general aviation is as a consequence of, obviously, the new runway that is under construction at the moment, and the particular issue about access to the general aviation area was in regard to protecting safety and also protecting security. That is as much detail as I have. If you want any more detail, I can take that on notice for you.

...

**Senator RICE:** Can you tell me why there is not a separated bike lane and pedestrian access provided as part of the underpass?

**Ms Horrocks:** As I said earlier, I understand it is about personal safety and security issues with regard to the underpass.

**Senator RICE:** Can you expand on that?

**Ms Horrocks:** I am sorry; I cannot, but I can provide you further details of that later.

**Senator RICE:** How are you going to resolve the fact that it is then cutting off walking and cycling access? You can have underpasses that provide for personal safety. There are many underpasses all around the country that provide for personal safety. Similarly, there are many underpasses around the country that have separated bike facilities. To me it seems like something that should be resolvable.

**Ms Horrocks:** I will, obviously, get you further details on that as I take that on notice, but I do understand that there is a safety issue and a security issue. That is as much detail as I can give you today.

**Senator RICE:** Okay. Thank you.

**Answer:**

The Department understands the decision not to include cycle and pedestrian access in the design of the Dryandra Road underpass was made by Brisbane Airport Corporation (BAC) in the interests of site security and for the safety of all road users, given the ongoing construction activities in this area. The underpass will be used primarily by freight and heavy vehicle traffic, and BAC therefore considers it is most appropriate to separate cycle and pedestrian movements from such an environment.

BAC advises that it is strongly committed to active transport on-airport, with an existing cycle network covering over 50 per cent of landside roads and more than \$1.5 million having been invested in cycling infrastructure over the past three years. BAC's current Master Plan commits to further expanding the Airport's active transport network and increasing the share of active transport movements at the Airport.

**Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**  
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE  
Budget Estimates 2017 - 2018  
**Infrastructure and Regional Development**

**Committee Question Number: 95**  
**Departmental Question Number: SQ17-000244**

**Program: 2.4 Air Transport**  
**Division/Agency: Aviation and Airports**  
**Topic: Melbourne Airport Runway Development Program**  
**Proof Hansard Page: 23-25 (23 May 2017)**

**Senator Rice, Janet asked:**

**Senator RICE:** Moving away from drones and onto the Tullamarine third runway and other works that are occurring at Tullamarine airport. Can you confirm that there are currently three processes that involve Tullamarine Airport. We have the master plan, where the next one is being developed in 2018. We have the new third runway, running east-west, and the extension of the current east-west runway.

...

**Senator RICE:** So you have to separate projects but they are both being included under the major development plan. Will they be assessed separately or will they be amalgamated?

**Ms Horrocks:** As I said earlier, that has not been finalised as yet.

**Senator RICE:** What is the process going to be for finalising that decision?

**Ms Horrocks:** We will be working with APAM on that.

...

**Senator RICE:** Right. The other issue is the timing.

**Ms Spence:** Yes.

**Senator RICE:** If you have two projects that are being undertaken and, in fact, are happening at quite different times, if there is something that is more imminent then it is more likely to be of interest to the community.

**Ms Spence:** I expect those are the issues that would be taken into account dealing with APAM, whether it is easier for the community to deal with a single consultation on the two projects through a single document or if the timing means that one is happening far sooner and then to split them into two.

**Senator RICE:** When do you expect APAM will make that decision?

**Ms Horrocks:** I am not sure. We are in constant contact with them, almost on a daily basis, and talking with them about the projects and where things are up to. Obviously, there are a whole range of things which need to come together.

**Senator RICE:** Could you take that on notice—when it is expected and whether there will be one plan or another.

**Ms Horrocks:** Yes.

**Answer:**

APAM has not advised the Department whether it intends to provide one Major Development Plan (MDP) encompassing both the new east-west runway and extension of the existing east west runway or whether they intend to submit separate MDPs. The timeframe for APAM to finalise its approach is dependent upon the project timeframe and the requirements prescribed by the *Airports Act 1996*.

**Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**  
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE  
Budget Estimates 2017 - 2018  
**Infrastructure and Regional Development**

**Committee Question Number:** 96  
**Departmental Question Number:** SQ17-000253

**Program:** 2.4 Air Transport  
**Division/Agency:** Aviation and Airports  
**Topic:** Commonwealth's legal position and update on Public Safety Zones  
**Proof Hansard Page:** 83-84 (23 May 2017)

**Senator Xenophon, Nick asked:**

**Senator XENOPHON:** So do you think that building, the DFO at Essendon, with its proximity to the end of the runway, would meet your criteria for fulfilling CASA's views as to the safety criteria for a building of that size, of that height, in that proximity to the runway?

...

**Senator XENOPHON:** So if the ATSB says, 'We need to review public safety zones—

**Mr Carmody:** I would be very interested if they came out with something like that. At the moment, the investigation is afoot, I understand. I do not know what the cause of the accident was. I know what the consequences were. But I think that that is part of the picture.

**Senator XENOPHON:** There is always the cause, but would the outcome have been different if that building were not in the way?

**Mr Carmody:** And that is correct.

**Senator XENOPHON:** And it also is those on the ground, in that building. Just to finalise that, Mr Mrdak, could you please, on notice, provide me with details of what the department says are the legal and constitutional limitations of the Commonwealth overriding state planning laws in relation to these issues.

**Mr Mrdak:** Certainly.

**Senator XENOPHON:** I am surprised that not even the corporations power, or various powers, could be used in respect—

**Mr Mrdak:** We will provide you an update on where the work on public safety zones is up to and the legal position.

**Answer:**

Public Safety Zones (PSZs) are a land-use planning tool that reduce the risk of an air transport accident affecting people who live, work or travel in close proximity to airports. They enable suitable development to be properly located, noting that the risk of an air transport accident is already very low. The Commonwealth's approach to the establishment of PSZs in the vicinity of Australian airports is to work cooperatively with the States and Territories through the National Airports Safeguarding Advisory Group (NASAG). If agreement on PSZs cannot be reached at NASAG, the Commonwealth may consider what options are available for legislating to regulate off-airport land use in PSZs for the purpose of protecting the safety of people on and near airports from any risks arising from aviation operations, noting that, as far as the department is aware, the relevant legislative powers have not been relied upon for this purpose previously.

Prior to the next NASAG meeting on 2 August 2017, members have agreed to brief their respective Ministers on a draft PSZ Guideline developed by the Commonwealth and Queensland Governments in consultation with other NASAG members. If State and Territory Ministers agree, the Guideline will proceed to targeted stakeholder consultation in the second half of 2017.

**Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**  
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE  
Budget Estimates 2017 - 2018  
**Infrastructure and Regional Development**

**Committee Question Number:** 97  
**Departmental Question Number:** SQ17-000254

**Program:** 2.4 Air Transport  
**Division/Agency:** Aviation and Airports  
**Topic:** Publication of National Airports Safeguarding Advisory Group meeting minutes  
**Proof Hansard Page:** 84 (23 May 2017)

**Senator Xenophon, Nick asked:**

**Ms Spence:** We have been progressing this through the National Airports Safeguarding Advisory Group. It is a matter where we have had to get agreement from all the states and territories. As Mr Mrdak mentioned, on 14 March members reconfirmed their commitment to developing and implementing the public safety zone guidance for airports. The next meeting of NASAG is on 2 August, and before that NASAG members are going to brief their respective ministers on the draft public safety zone guidelines that have been developed by the Commonwealth and the Queensland governments in consultation with NASAG members. Subject to the minister's agreement, NASAG will conduct targeted stakeholder consultation with selected airports in the second half of 2017, and then the draft guidelines will be released for wider consultation.

**Senator XENOPHON:** Are these minutes made public?

**Ms Spence:** I do not think the minutes of NASAG are made public.

**Mr Mrdak:** No.

**Senator XENOPHON:** Is there any reason why they cannot be made public?

**Mr Mrdak:** I am happy to take that on notice.

**Senator XENOPHON:** Maybe it is a question for the committee as to whether or not they are made public as well. But can you take it on notice, and if you do not wish to make them public then it could be a question of an order for the production of documents. I will put some questions on notice.

**Answer:**

Consistent with other Commonwealth-State officials groups, the minutes of the National Airports Safeguarding Advisory Group (NASAG) are not made public noting that NASAG is not a decision-making body.

**Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Budget Estimates 2017 - 2018

**Infrastructure and Regional Development**

**Committee Question Number: 98**

**Departmental Question Number: SQ17-000255**

**Program: 2.4**

**Division/Agency: Aviation and Airports**

**Topic: Import Controls for Drones**

**Proof Hansard Page: 87 (23 May 2017)**

**Senator Fawcett, David asked:**

**Senator FAWCETT:** To follow up briefly, before Senator Back starts a different line of questioning: we have talked before, when discussing ARPAS, the fact that this should be a whole-of-government solution—not just the safety regulation, but also import restrictions. I raised the question at the time: have you engaged with other departments? That includes you as well, Mr Mrdak. At the time you had no answer for me. Can I ask the question again: have you engaged with other departments specifically to look at import prohibitions for drones that do not meet a requirement that we may choose to lay down, in terms of shaping the safety environment for drones, to ensure compliance, given that, to date, voluntary education in the form of things on your website or pieces of paper in a box have not proven to curtail or restrict the way that some people choose to use these devices?

**Mr Mrdak:** The department has been scoping the issue of import controls. That is part of the work that will feed into the government's position on these matters.

**Senator FAWCETT:** Can I just clarify: when you say 'scoping', are you talking internally, or have you engaged with other government departments?

**Mr Carmody:** My understanding is we have engaged with other government departments, but, if Ms Spence cannot help, I will confirm that on notice.

**Ms Spence:** We have had some high-level discussions, but I will take on notice any more details that I can provide.

**Answer:**

The Civil Aviation Safety Authority (CASA), which has aviation safety regulatory responsibility for Remotely Piloted Aircraft System (RPAS) operations, is engaging with federal, state and territorial law enforcement authorities on improving the coordination of actions to enforce laws governing RPAS and RPAS-related activities, including the use of counter-drone devices by law enforcement agencies.

CASA is undertaking a review of aviation safety regulation of RPAS and will be releasing a discussion paper shortly calling for public, industry and agency comments on the paper.

At this stage, the Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development broader consultations on RPAS have focussed on CASA and the Attorney Generals Department in the preparation of advice to the Government on its response to the House of Representatives Inquiry on RPAS.

The Department will continue to consult with other Government departments and agencies as appropriate.



**Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**  
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE  
Budget Estimates 2017 - 2018  
**Infrastructure and Regional Development**

**Committee Question Number:** 99  
**Departmental Question Number:** SQ17-000317

**Program:** 2.4 Air Transport  
**Division/Agency:** Aviation and Airports  
**Topic:** Melbourne Airport Master Plan  
**Proof Hansard Page:** Written (6 June 2017)

**Senator Rice, Janet asked:**

1. I understand that Melbourne Airport is proposing to run the Master Plan 2018 and the proposed runway addition/extension projects together. Would the Master Plan 2018 have to be approved and in existence prior to approval for runway MDP project?
2. I understand that the Melbourne Airport Strategy (MAS) of 1990 was the original strategic document for the new airport at Tullamarine, and that since the privatisation of the airport, each Melbourne Airport Master Plan subsequent has continued to refer to the planned four runways. In the 1990 document, specific mention was made of arrivals from the east and it was determined that arrivals would generally occur during peak periods. However, it appears that The Master Plan 2103 does not mention any of the measures listed above, contained in the MAS 1990. On what basis is the Department satisfied the Master Plan 2013 is consistent with the findings and recommendation of the MAS 1990?

**Answer:**

1. An MDP must be consistent with the approved Master Plan in place at the time the MDP is submitted. In this case this could mean either the 2013 or the 2018 Master Plan.
2. The Melbourne Airport Strategy (MAS) was the original strategic document for the airport at Tullamarine back in 1990. Since the establishment of the *Airports Act 1996* and its subsequent privatisation, each iteration of the Melbourne Airport Master Plan becomes the prevailing strategic document. Master Plans do not need to be consistent with the MAS.

**Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Budget Estimates 2017 - 2018

**Infrastructure and Regional Development**

**Committee Question Number: 100**

**Departmental Question Number: SQ17-000318**

**Program: 2.4 Air Transport**

**Division/Agency: Aviation and Airports**

**Topic: Active transport at Brisbane Airport**

**Proof Hansard Page: Written (6 June 2017)**

**Senator Rice, Janet asked:**

1. Regarding Brisbane Airport, I'm advised that there is no pedestrian access or safe bicycle routes to the Domestic Terminal, or Banksia Place, or Da Vinci Precinct at the Brisbane Airport. Does the airport have plans to build safe bicycle and pedestrian connections to these areas? If so, when will they be completed?
2. I understand that the 2014 Brisbane Airport Masterplan lists active transport initiatives for the next five years as: 'Expand the active transport network across the airport' and 'Improve footpaths, aiming to improve pedestrian connectivity between key precincts'. What will the Department do to ensure the Brisbane Airport Corporation complies with the Airport Masterplan in regard to provision for active transport users?
3. Given that the proposed underpass at Dryandra Road at Brisbane Airport will preclude active transport users – how will the Brisbane Airport Corporation going to stop people walking through the underpass when they have no other option to get to their place of work? And how will their safety be ensured?
4. How does the Brisbane Airport Corporation propose pedestrians and cyclists access the general aviation area, other than incurring a personal expense on shuttle buses, taxi fares or private transport?
5. Given changes to pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure at Brisbane Airport, how are the people who catch the train or bus to the domestic terminal and then walk the 750m to work expected to get to work now?

**Answer:**

1. The Brisbane Airport Ground Transport Plan (GTP) contained in its Master Plan was developed by Brisbane Airport Corporation. The GTP outlines, in relation to the first 5 years of the Master Plan, a plan for a ground transport system on the landside of the airport. The response to SQ17-000243 provides further information relevant to this question.
2. Airport Master Plans are strategic planning documents to, amongst other things, indicate the development intentions of an Airport Lessee Company for a federally-leased airport site. The Department, through the regulatory framework of the *Airports Act 1996* and subordinate regulations, ensures all on-airport development is consistent with an airport's approved Master Plan.
3. See answer 1 and refer to Committee question number 94.
4. See answer 1 and refer to Committee question number 94.
5. See answer 1 and refer to Committee question number 94.