

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Supplementary Budget Estimates October 2009
Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local Government

Question No.: CASA 01

Division/Agency: Civil Aviation Safety Authority

Topic: Cost of TAWS

Hansard Page: 138 (20/10/09)

Senator Macdonald asked:

Senator IAN MACDONALD—It will be very short! In response to some questions last time about TAWS A and TAWS B, you have given me some information. I had actually asked what the cost of a TAWS B—and if I can add to that TAWS A—might be. I said \$10,000, \$100,000, \$1,000, what is it? You took it on notice. You gave me an answer on notice but you did not answer that part of the question. What is the cost of a terrain awareness warning system A, which is a terrain display and radar altimeter, and a TAWS B, which is just, as I understand it, a terrain display; capable of allowing a terrain display.

Mr McCormick—Yes, that is correct. We will get that information for you, if I can get back to you during this session. We thought that answer was comprehensive but obviously it was not.

Answer:

The range of the costs involved in retrofitting an aircraft will vary depending on the specific equipment purchased and installation complexities of various aircraft. Manufacturers of the equipment advised CASA of the following approximate representative costs.

TAWS-Class B: \$23,000 (installed)

TAWS-Class A: \$100,000-\$150,000 (installed)

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Supplementary Budget Estimates October 2009
Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local Government

Question No.: CASA 02

Division/Agency: Civil Aviation Safety Authority

Topic: Standard Used In Drug Testing

Hansard Page: 140 (20/10/09)

Senator Back asked:

Senator BACK—Excellent. The only other question I have—and I am very interested to learn about those figures, which I think are remarkably low and you ought to be congratulated—is in relation to your integrity testing. Does the department subscribe to Australian Standard 4760, I think it is—‘Procedures for specimen collection and the detection and quantification of drugs in oral fluid’? Is that basically the guideline that the department is using?

Mr McCormick—I am not aware of what the actual number is, but I can take that on notice and let you know.

Answer:

CASA’s random testing program is in accordance with Legislative Instrument 263/09. This Instrument follows closely the guiding principles of Australian Standard 4760.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Supplementary Budget Estimates October 2009
Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local Government

Question No.: CASA 03

Division/Agency: Civil Aviation Safety Authority

Topic: Filming at GAAP Aerodromes

Hansard Page/s: Written Question

Senator Heffernan asked:

Camden Airport & filming of "Top Gear"-

1. When filming, runway closures place additional pressure on student pilots who are expected to have aircraft back to base in order for following training sessions. With foreign students being trained at Bankstown airport and sent across for circuit training at Camden due to congestion at Bankstown, does CASA see a potential danger due the closure of the main runway leaving a short (half the length of the main runway) grass strip with restricted taxiway access for operations?
2. What does CASA intend doing about the situation where BAL (Bankstown Airport Ltd) is advertising film studio use of Camden Airport, closing the main runway and taxiways to enable use by TV and car companies? The Sydney basin has insufficient capacity to handle the current training traffic, isn't this a misuse of airports and a detriment to safety?
3. Airports are primarily intended for aircraft use, there are dedicated racetracks e.g. Eastern Creek available for car testing and filming. Airports should be available at all times for normal and emergency aircraft operations. No other GAAP airport permits this activity to happen. Only Jandakot has permitted this type of activity before, it has however ceased the practice, under an alleged direction from CASA. If this is correct, doesn't it illustrate inconsistency within regulatory oversight of GA airports?
4. Can CASA confirm that a similar situation occurred at Jandakot Airport where the airport was used for filming and CASA directed the airport operator to cease this activity? Can you provide details of this incident/incidents?

Answer:

1. Aerodrome operators are responsible for meeting specific civil aviation safety regulatory requirements when closing runways. In the instance of Camden aerodrome runway closures the aerodrome operator complied with regulatory requirements, including notification to operators directly at the airfield and through the Notice to Airman (NOTAM) system.
2. The activities that can be undertaken at a leased Federal airport are controlled by the *Airports Act 1996*, the terms of the airport lease between the Commonwealth and the airport-lessee company and the airport's Master Plan. The Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local Government is responsible for ensuring that the airport operator complies with these obligations and will continue to ensure that all regulatory requirements are met.
3. No.
4. Prior to 2002 Jandakot Airport occasionally closed a runway for vehicle testing or similar activity. In 2002, while one runway was closed, an incident occurred in the circuit and an ATSB incident report was raised. Jandakot Airport Holdings Pty Ltd decided that they would no longer permit such activities in the future and advised CASA of this decision.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Supplementary Budget Estimates October 2009
Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local Government

Question No.: CASA 04

Division/Agency: Civil Aviation Safety Authority

Topic: GAAP Circuit and Entry Points

Hansard Page/s: Written Question

Senator Heffernan asked:

1. CASA have imposed a cap of 6 aircraft per runway in use at GAAP (*General Aviation Aerodrome Procedures*) airports, at Bankstown when parallel runway operations are in operation and 12 aircraft can operate in the circuit. This involves two separate radio frequencies, however often Bankstown is operated using one frequency and the cap is reduced to 6. This often results in aircraft being denied entry clearance. The situation is further exacerbated by the two entry points, aircraft entering Bankstown must arrive via 2RN or Prospect Reservoir, there have already been 4 fatalities over 2RN in the last few years, prior to the cap, now aircraft denied entry are orbiting or turning back into the traffic heading for the entry point.

The situation now is far more dangerous than before CASA reacted to the Ambidji report and imposed the cap, shifting the danger from the airport to the entry points. What is CASA doing about this developing dangerous situation and when will they lift the Cap?

2. The two entry points have always posed a danger, the recent and past accidents demonstrate that fact. The potential for conflict of aircraft of differing performance arriving at an entry point from oblique approach paths is obvious. At the entry point pilots are often listening to the Aerodrome Traffic Information Service (ATIS), then calling the Tower for clearance meanwhile trying to keep a lookout for other aircraft. This involves changes of radio frequency, a work load if you have two radios, but if you have only one it becomes doubly difficult for the inexperienced student. What does CASA intend doing about entry points to GAAP airports?
3. The clearance to cross runways is a necessary safety initiative, however at night at Bankstown when only one runway is in use and illuminated. Why is clearance required to cross the unlit runway after landing and clearing the active runway? The changes to introduce a US Class D model to GAAP airports need to be implemented without undue delay, to offset the dangers identified in the Ambidji report, but at present we have an interim set of operating rules that have created an additional risk factor. CASA needs to implement the changes as soon as possible and to remove the impediments to operations as soon as possible. What is the time frame for full implementation of these changes?

Answer:

1. The cap on the number of aircraft operating in the circuit at GAAP aerodromes was an interim measure introduced on 21 July 2009. CASA has consulted further with industry and updated the safety management of operations at GAAP airports.

From 18 January 2010 the maximum number of aeroplanes operating in the circuit and undertaking circuit operations under the control of one Air Traffic Controller within a

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Supplementary Budget Estimates October 2009
Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local Government

GAAP Control Zone (CTR) will be increased from six to eight. Arriving and departing traffic to and from the GAAP CTR will be managed by Air Traffic Control, with no directed limitation imposed by CASA.

These changes follow a review initiated by the Director of Aviation Safety into the aeroplane circuit cap. This review included Hazard Identification workshops conducted by CASA and Aerosafe Risk Management at each of the GAAP aerodromes.

2. and 3. The need for changes to the inbound reporting points will be considered in conjunction with the transition to Class D airspace at Bankstown.

At GAAP aerodromes there are often times when runways are not active and in the past could be crossed without clearance. To reduce the risk of runway incursions, gaining clearance before entering and crossing any runway is now a requirement at the GAAP aerodromes.

CASA expects Airservices Australia to provide an Air Traffic Control Service as appropriate for airspace classified as Class D on or before 3 June 2010 at the six GAAP aerodromes. Australia will be adopting Class D procedures based upon the US Federal Aviation Administration Class D procedures.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Supplementary Budget Estimates October 2009
Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local Government

Question No.: CASA 05

Division/Agency: Civil Aviation Safety Authority

Topic: Random Drug Testing

Hansard Page/s: Written Question

Senator Heffernan asked:

Random Drug Testing

In reference to the response of Mr McCormick that “we are anticipating end of June or early July to return to drug testing, which will give us enough time to complete all our protocols and make sure we are correct.”

1. Has random drug testing recommenced?
2. How many tests have been conducted since testing recommenced?
3. How many positive results have been recorded since testing recommenced?
4. Have there been any more false positives recorded like the one at the Victorian Aero Club at Moorabbin on 8 April 2009?

Answer:

1. Yes.
2. CASA has conducted 1835 alcohol tests and 1245 drug tests.
3. Between CASA testing, and in-house testing conducted voluntarily by some participating organisations and reported to CASA, there have been 7 positives for alcohol out of 14273 tests, and 17 positives for drugs out of 4091 tests. This gives 0.05% positivity for alcohol and 0.4% positivity for drugs.
4. No.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Supplementary Budget Estimates October 2009
Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local Government

Question No.: CASA 06

Division/Agency: Civil Aviation Safety Authority

Topic: Western Australia Route Review Project (WARRP)

Hansard Page/s: Written Question

Senator Back asked:

- 1 What role did CASA play in the Western Australia Route Review Project?
- 2 Why did CASA instruct Airservices Australia make change Perth Flight Paths?
- 3 Who has access to the environmental assessment report on the impact of these changes to the flight path?
- 4 Should this document have formed part of public consultation surrounding changes to air flight paths? If not, why?
- 5 Will you make publicly available the document which suggested these changes?

Answer:

- 1 & 2 CASA issued Airservices with a Request for Corrective Action (RCA), which Airservices responded to with the Western Australia Route Review Project. CASA, as the safety regulator oversighted the project to make sure it met the requirements of the RCA.
- 3 Airservices Australia.
- 4 That is a matter for Airservices Australia.
- 5 Refer to response for 1&2 above.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Supplementary Budget Estimates October 2009
Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local Government

Question No.: CASA 07

Division/Agency: Civil Aviation Safety Authority

Topic: Onboard Recording Devices

Hansard Page/s: Written Question

Senator Heffernan asked:

Howarth Aerospace Consultancy has studied aircraft accidents for approximately 12 years within Australia and oversee many in the USA.

1. Why hasn't the federal government taken any actions to implement the findings of the ATSB recommendations as supplied below?

Recommendation issued to: CASA Civil Aviation Safety Authority

Output No: R20060004

Date Issued: 02 February 2006

Background: [Why this Recommendation was developed](#)

Safety Recommendation

Output Text: The Australian Transport Safety Bureau recommends that the Civil Aviation Safety Authority (CASA), review the requirements for the carriage of on-board recording devices in Australian registered aircraft as a consequence of technological developments.

Response from: Civil Aviation Safety Authority

Date Received: 11 May 2006

Response Status: Closed - Accepted

Response Text: The Civil Aviation Safety Authority will analyse the cost benefit of the recommendation regarding the carriage of on-board recording devices to this type of operation

Response from: CASA

Date Received: 17 July 2007

Response Status: Closed - Accepted

Response Text: On the issue of on board recording devices, this is a cost and maintenance burden with existing equipment. Low cost/new technology units are not currently available.
CASA will continue to monitor this.

Response from: CASA

Date Received: 07 September 2007

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Supplementary Budget Estimates October 2009
Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local Government

Response Status: Closed - Accepted

In reference to ATSB recommendation R20060004 (issued following the Benalla accident) on page 34 of the draft report [relating to 200502662]: *The Australian Transport Safety Bureau recommends that the Civil Aviation Safety Authority (CASA) review the requirements for the carriage of on-board recording devices in Australian registered aircraft as a consequence of technical developments.*

Response Text: As you are aware, on 11 May 2006 CASA advised of an intention to conduct a cost/benefit analysis of the recommendation regarding the carriage of on-board recording devices to this type of operation.

I understand that CASA has previously investigated this matter and, based on the equipment available at the time, could not justify mandating carriage of recording devices on low capacity aircraft. However, given other priorities, this has not yet been confirmed by way of a cost/benefit analysis.

I have now directed that a cost/benefit analysis be undertaken. I expect to have a result before the end of the year and will forward the results to you.

Response from: CASA

Date Received: 20 December 2007

Response Status: Closed - Accepted

Response Text: I refer to the letter dated 11 October 2007 from the Deputy Director, Information and Investigations to General Manager, Corporate Relations[CASA], enclosing an advance copy of amended Transport Safety Investigation Report on the fatal accident involving a Piper PA-31-350 aircraft registered VH-PYN, which occurred near Condobolin, New South Wales on 2 December 2006.

The draft Cost Benefit Analysis for on-board recording devices will be completed by the end of this week [21 Dec 2007]. Consideration of this is to be completed and CASA will write to you again by the end of January 2008. **ATSB Note:** On 31 January 2008, CASA advised that the cost benefit analysis was being evaluated.

Response from: CASA

Date Received: 23 November 2008

Response Status: Closed - Accepted

Response Text: I refer to my letter of 7 September 2007 regarding the Australian Transport Safety Bureau (ATSB) Recommendation R20060004 relating to the Civil Aviation Safety Authority (CASA) reviewing the requirements for the carriage of on-board recording (OBR) devices in Australian registered aircraft. As you would be aware, there has been extensive liaison between CASA and

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Supplementary Budget Estimates October 2009
Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local Government

the ATSB on this matter over the last twelve months. I can now advise that CASA has completed its cost benefit analysis (CBA). The CBA results confirm CASA's initial view that there is no justification to mandate the carriage of recording devices in smaller aircraft. The analysis considered 7 categories of small aeroplane operations, from Low Capacity RPT and Charter, down to aerial work, business and private operations and did not find fitment justified on safety grounds.

CASA believes that the safety regulator's focus should be on passenger carrying operations and preventing accidents by fitment of new generation technologies such as Airborne Collision Avoidance Systems, Terrain Avoidance and Warning Systems and Automatic Dependent Surveillance Broadcast equipment, rather than mandating fitment of OBR devices to assist in determining the cause of an accident.

The CBA determined that the industry was unlikely to make this investment on its own accord. The use of quick access recorders by larger airlines provides considerable economic and business benefits which outweigh the costs involved. With the recent emergence of low cost and light weight recorders for small aircraft it is expected that the take up of recorders may gather momentum over the next couple of years once suppliers become more active in the market and prices come down. In the interim, CASA will be monitoring voluntary fitment of OBRs.

The NSTB (National Transportation Safety Board) in the United States of America have the same request for FDRs (Flight Data Recorder) are on the most wanted list to be implemented as shown below:

H.R. 2632 (2003) and H.R. 3336 (2005)

Support for Proposed Flight Data Recorder (FDR) and Cockpit Voice Recorder (CVR) Upgrades, to provide dual recorders, front and rear, and a rear deployable recorder.

NADA/F has twice supported bi-partisan legislation to require updated dual recorders including a deployable rear recorder, from 2002 through 2006.

Although neither legislation passed, we hope legislation will be introduced again. While the FAA and NTSB have approved some upgraded standards for recorders, the traveling public needs more.

Special thank you to Congressmen David Price (D-NC) and John Duncan, Jr. (R-TN) for their leadership and support, and to the other Members of Congress who signed on to the legislation.

About Flight Data Recorders

The "Black Box" has always been the most important tool in air crash investigation, which includes the Flight Data Recorder (FDR) and Cockpit Voice Recorder (CVR). Yet the industry in the U.S., and the FAA, have a long history of delaying much-needed upgrades in FDR/CVR equipment on passenger planes. NADA/F firmly believes that any delay in the recovery of flight data hinders the accident investigation progress.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Supplementary Budget Estimates October 2009
Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local Government

It is so important that today's technology be used on today's planes! For years the NTSB, NADA/F and others have pushed for better quality, more parameters, 25 hours of continuous sound, an independent power source, and more; but still the industry and the FAA delays these much needed upgrades.

On March 9, 1999, the NTSB recommended dual combined FDR/CVR units, one in the front, and one in the rear, to provide data recovery back-up.

2. Australia should be in the lead with this type of technology. Howarth Aerospace has been developing such a system over 12 years, the system has been demonstrated to CASA-ATSB and bodies within the aviation industry and allows a cost saving of millions of dollars to the Australian government each year - could we have an update with these systems and this technology?

Answer:

1 & 2.

As indicated in CASA's response to the ATSB on 23 November 2008, CASA conducted a cost-benefit analysis of the fitment of on-board recording devices in small aircraft and could not justify establishing, on safety grounds, a regulatory requirement for fitment. CASA will continue to monitor technological developments in this area and related operational data. In the future it may be possible to justify a mandate for fitment. In the interim, aircraft operators may choose to fit on-board recorders on a voluntary basis, as determined by efficiency and other operational considerations.

CASA regulations aim to achieve the greatest net safety benefits. In this regard CASA's priority is on safety systems designed to prevent accidents in the first instance, including the fitment of new generation technologies such as Airborne Collision Avoidance Systems, Terrain Avoidance and Warning Systems and Automatic Dependent Surveillance Broadcast equipment.