

# **SUNSHINE COAST FLIGHT PATH CHANGES POST IMPLEMENTATION REVIEW COMMUNITY WEBEX MEETING**

**Questions and Answers**

**Version 1.0**

**Effective Date: 17 December 2020**

# CHANGE SUMMARY

Version	Date	Change Description
1	17 December 2020	Document created

## CONTENTS

<b>CHANGE SUMMARY</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>1. BACKGROUND</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2. QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS</b>	<b>3</b>
2.1. Process	3
2.2. Noise modelling, noise monitoring and environmental assessments	7
2.3. Sunshine Coast Council Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)	13
2.4. Environmental impacts other than noise	16
2.5. Operations	17
2.6. Aircraft noise information and regulation	19
2.7. General comments	21
2.8. Council involvement	23
<b>3. DEFINITIONS</b>	<b>24</b>

# 1. BACKGROUND

We held a community Webex meeting, on Tuesday 8 December from 5.30pm to 7.00 pm, to provide an update on the feedback we received during the public comment period for the draft Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Sunshine Coast Flight Path Changes Post Implementation Review (PIR), and our consideration of that feedback.

The questions in the left hand columns were posted by community members attending the Webex meeting. Airservices responses to these questions are provided in the right hand columns.

Some responses were provided verbally during the meeting. While we may have paraphrased these responses, we have attempted to remain true to the verbal response.

We have grouped like questions (remaining in verbatim form as they were typed) to reduce repetition of response information. In some cases, short comments were posted but due to the rapid nature of the questions coming through it is not clear what these related to. This has been stated in the response columns. Where questions identified a particular individual by name we have removed the name and indicated this in the question.

# 2. QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

## 2.1. Process

Question/Comment	Airservices Response
It would be helpful to view the updated ToR as you are making these comments so that the updates you are talking about can be easily related to the document.	We will provide the updated draft Terms of Reference on <i>Engage Airservices</i> on Friday (11 December 2020).
Can you please email this draft PIR after meeting	
Airservices re [name removed] point it might be helpful to send the updated draft with the tracked changes shown. Council does that with planning scheme amendments and it makes it easy for the community to see what the changes are and where the changes are being made.	We will provide a marked up (tracked changes) and a clean copy of the draft Terms of Reference.
Can you please send a cheat list of the acronyms with the TOR / PIR meetings? It will make it easier to follow if we know what the acronym means.	There is a list of acronyms in the updated draft ToR. We have also included a list of acronyms to the Webex presentation.
Will we all receive a copy of this presentation tonight after the session concludes? I'm asking about a copy of this PPT that Donna is running through this evening. Will we also receive this?	We will provide a copy of the Webex presentation on <i>Engage Airservices</i> by Friday 11 December 2020.
I have asked many questions in the chat...will they be answered?	During the meeting, there were over 150 questions and comments from participants. While we were able to answer some of these during the Q&A session, we were not able to get to them all. We will upload a record of all questions and our answers to <i>Engage Airservices</i> .
These are questions I'd like to be included to be addressed.	
Please ensure all chat comments are available after the meeting as part of the information upload to the Engage webpage.	

Question/Comment	Airservices Response
<p>Please could you clarify - did you just say that the CEP will design the process? I may have misheard what you said.</p>	<p>The comment was that the process for the PIR is covered in the ToR. It outlines what the scope is, what the principles are, the broad criteria, and assessment approach.</p> <p>The Community Engagement Plan (CEP) defines the process for our engagement with the community - what elements, what timeframe, what mechanism and the principles applied etc.</p> <p>The process is covered through both the TOR and CEP - they speak to the Aircraft Noise Ombudsman (ANO) Recommendation about ensuring we have a genuine engagement approach to the PIR.</p> <p>Many of the PIR elements we are covering from a scope perspective are our typical PIR elements so we are trying to flesh out through the Principles and CEP the intent of the ANO recommendation around ensuring genuine community involvement.</p>
<p>So will it be clear on the level of influence the community will have in this 'engagement'?</p>	<p>Yes, the level of engagement for activities is described in the CEP.</p>
<p>Please make sure residents are consulted not just the lobby groups.</p>	<p>The CEP outlines how we will engage with all community members.</p>
<p>I agree please make sure you consult with individual Residents not just the Lobby groups</p>	<p>The CEP includes the overarching philosophy behind our engagement approach, which is to ensure that all community members have access to the same information and all community members and communities are treated equally in their involvement in the PIR.</p>
<p>Are you able to send emails to all registered parties each time an update is posted on engage website please</p>	<p><i>Engage Airservices</i> can provide news alerts to registered participants. It does not automatically provide these updates every time there is new content added.</p> <p>We will use the news updates frequently throughout the engagement program to generate awareness of upcoming activity and updates to content on our website. We will notify of key activities and milestone dates. However, we encourage you to visit regularly if you are interested in this project.</p> <p>During the early part of phase one, we will include a schedule noting the proposed timing of updates on <i>Engage Airservices</i> based on the CEP program.</p>
<p>What else is actually possible and greater?</p>	<p>Unclear what this question refers to.</p>
<p>Why hasn't ASA yet apologised to communities for its failings identified by the ANO?</p>	<p>We recognise there is a trust deficit. Trust takes a lifetime to build and a minute to lose. We</p>

Question/Comment	Airservices Response
The trust deficit is not addressed by misrepresenting proposed suggestions for improvement. A more genuine attempt to respond with integrity and honesty is required.	acknowledge this and have a genuine desire to work with the community and desire to rebuild trust.
How will this PIR address the very low levels of community trust as a result of poor processes as outlined in the ANO Report.	<p>The draft ToR and the draft CEP contain the core principles, developed with community members at our first meeting on Saturday 19 September 2020.</p> <p>We commit to the application of these principles, together with the IAP2 Principles, throughout the PIR.</p> <p>We recognise however, that trust will not be re-gained through the development of these documents. It will be through the application of the process.</p>
Please clarify the duration of the ToR Final Comment period and the CEP feedback period and if these are closed loop mechanisms, i.e. ASA will accept community feedback but make no commitment to update or make further changes to either document. Thanks	The updated draft ToR will be available for public review from Friday 11 December 2020 to Sunday 17 January 2021. We will take feedback on the updated draft over this period, but we would appreciate it if this covers new areas of interest rather than reiterating previous feedback where this has already been responded to.
Given the time of year, the 15th January is not an adequate period time. Please reconsider.	<p>We recognise that some community members are happy to take longer to confirm the ToR, but we need to balance this against those who would like us to commence with Phase One activities. The ToR has already been subject to detailed community review, as well as discussion through face-to-face and online community meetings. We have extended the initial deadline by two days from a Friday evening to a Sunday evening, but need to finalise it by Sunday 31 January 2021.</p> <p>The draft CEP will be available for a public comment period from Friday 11 December 2020 through to Sunday 31 January 2021. The timing to finalise the CEP will be dependent on the feedback we receive.</p> <p>This will mean we will commence Phase One PIR activity while we continue to engage on the CEP, however early activity will involve information provision around submission of community suggested alternatives, noise modelling and current operations. We believe we can complete this activity in parallel and ahead of the more intensive phase of engagement that the CEP needs to define.</p>
Setting a TOR finalisation date of 31 Jan is unacceptable given that ASA have not even waited for community feedback on a document that is yet to be shared with the community!!!	

Question/Comment	Airservices Response
	We may need to host a similar feedback and consideration Webex meeting before finalising the CEP.
Might I suggest that this type of communication is not really useful for having the community feel we have 'a say' as per the engagement? This is a one way communication.	<p>The purpose of this meeting was to share the feedback we received on the draft ToR and how we have considered and applied that feedback in the updated draft ToR. We hosted the discussion rather than simply putting the revised ToR out for public review.</p> <p>Participants were able to ask questions and provide comments, and we received over 150 questions and comments through this meeting, all of which we are responding to.</p>
Once again the 'engagement' process is rushed and flawed. The IAP2 specifically speaks to the need for appropriate time that allows communities to properly consider information, especially complex aviation information.	We do not feel that the engagement period is rushed or flawed and that appropriate time has been provided to consider and input to the ToR.
Exactly [name removed] Ultimately this is about these people who so called have the power making choices that change our lives with their choices and actions and even when we say no to that and this doesn't work they say we have the right to do this...	We first received a submissions providing suggested scope and requirements for the ToR on Friday 28 August 2020, with the first community meeting to discuss these requirements held on Saturday 19 September 2020. By the time we finalise the ToR, five months will have elapsed. To date we have considered over 500 submissions (not including the final review) and have engaged with 29 community groups and over 400 individuals in relation to it.
In abuse counselling it is called POWER OVER and ABUSE!!!	
ASA is not listening to the community, its review is directed towards justifying its initial flawed recommendations. Let's get fair dinkum	
Airservices PIR is therefore pointless in relation to the bulk of community concerns. It's a massive red herring.	<p>The community will also have a number of opportunities to engage in the process and to influence PIR outcomes, which are outlined in the draft CEP. We are engaging with the community to take feedback on the planned program of activity and to ensure the CEP will deliver the appropriate level of engagement.</p> <p>We recognise that there are differing views in the community. Some members would like us to commence the PIR as soon as possible, while others would like us to take longer. We need to balance the interest of all community members.</p>
Airservices' activities are governed by the Airservices Act and Ministerial Directives. The PIR is an Airservices undertaking, please explain how this applicable legislation has no relevance to the PIR.	<p>Airservices operates in accordance with the <i>Air Services Act 1995</i>, <i>EPBC Act 1999</i> and <i>Ministerial Directive M37/99</i>.</p> <p>The response noting there is no specific legislation that governs the steps or processes for PIRs, and therefore there is no relevant legislation to include in the PIR, refers to the fact that PIRs are an internal Airservices activity and are not required under any legislative instrument.</p>

Question/Comment	Airservices Response
	Some of the elements considered as part of a PIR are required through legislation, including the need for community and stakeholder engagement, environmental assessment of flight path changes, provision of aircraft noise related information etc., but our response was around legislation relevant to or governing PIRs.

## 2.2. Noise modelling, noise monitoring and environmental assessments

Question/Comment	Airservices Response
Will noise assessments include ambient measures?	Ambient noise monitoring was undertaken by Sunshine Coast Council as part of their Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). For more information and to view the locations visit <i>Volume B Chapter B15 Noise and Vibration and Volume D Chapter D3 Aircraft Noise</i> .
With all due respect, ambient noise is not about noise before aircraft started flying. It is the noise level when there are no aircraft flying. Which can be measured very well now, while there are few aircraft flying	<a href="https://www.statedevelopment.qld.gov.au/coordinate-general/assessments-and-approvals/coordinated-projects/completed-projects/sunshine-coast-airport-expansion/eis-documents">https://www.statedevelopment.qld.gov.au/coordinate-general/assessments-and-approvals/coordinated-projects/completed-projects/sunshine-coast-airport-expansion/eis-documents</a>
There's plenty of opportunities to take noise levels between flights and definitely as per [name removed] post in the higher properties of the hinterland	Airservices does not undertake ambient noise monitoring as part of our Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs).
I think a sensible way of looking at noise is also to look at the percentage increase of noise from ambient levels	While ambient noise levels are not factored into noise models (INM or AEDT), they are factored into the environmental assessment through the evaluation of rural or urban residential areas and application of different environmental assessment criteria. For example, a base assumption is made that ambient noise levels are lower in rural residential areas and therefore the noise impact assessment thresholds are set lower as appropriate (e.g. less aircraft movements will trigger significance criteria in rural residential areas than for urban residential locations).
I don't believe ambient noise levels were undertaken at locations under newly overflowed suburbs. Can you confirm?	
We were not consulted and there were definitely no ambient noise levels taken at our property or at any of the surrounding properties!	
Do you also include the noise level impact based on what the original noise levels were before this noise and toxic pollution was from these flight paths and planes were put over here without our permission?	As part of the EIA (Section 6), we provided noise contours before and after opening. This was done for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N60, N65 and N70 'number-above' noise metrics, that describe the number of noise events at a predefined noise level that would occur over a modelled busy day</li> <li>L<sub>Amax</sub> single event maximum noise metrics that depict maximum noise levels during</li> </ul>
Why isn't noise monitoring at a multitude of sites implemented immediately. Sites need to be agreed with the community and implemented asap.	



Question/Comment	Airservices Response
Anything less than this is a purposeful avoidance of the facts.	the arrival or departure of specific aircraft types.
What will be used as a "baseline" for noise assessment? Desktop modelling is insufficient.	<p>To provide information to the community on current noise levels, the draft ToR Phase One scope has been updated to reflect that we will undertake:</p> <p><i>Modelling of current noise impacts based on actual movement data (noting this will be limited to current COVID-19 impacted operations) with consideration of altitude and terrain.</i></p> <p>Based on the outcomes of the desktop noise modelling review, a short-term noise monitoring program will be implemented to enable comparison of actual noise levels with modelled forecast noise levels in the EIA.</p> <p>Potential noise monitoring locations will be identified in consultation with the community.</p> <p>As the noise monitors we will deploy for the PIR record 24/7, we can provide information on what the ambient noise levels are. We will look at effective ways to provide this information.</p> <p>Noise monitoring is not undertaken to determine compliance with aircraft noise regulations – there are no Australian regulations which specify a maximum allowed level of aircraft noise over a community.</p>
We want dB levels updated	<p>Undertaking noise monitoring now will not provide useful or reliable data due to aircraft not flying at the anticipated volume and possibly flying a range of aircraft types. If compared against our EIA modelled forecast, this will likely show we overestimated the impact.</p> <p>We can review aircraft movement since runway opening to model existing impacts and provide this information to the community. This has been added to the draft ToR (see above for specific wording).</p> <p>We will undertake noise monitoring at the appropriate time when we can get reliable aircraft movement noise data.</p> <p>Interstate border openings are expected to result in increased operations to Sunshine Coast from Victoria and New South Wales.</p>
Pre COVID levels could be many months away!	
We are already over anticipated levels, what will the end of COVID bring?	
Domestic flights may never return to pre COVID levels!	
When are aircraft expected to be at levels for proper monitoring?	
Monitoring noise levels now would deliver early indicators on how the previously predicted and current actual sound levels on new flight paths compare.	
This data could inform the predictions around the full impacts of regular flights once they recommence, post-COVID.	
Meant to say no baseline being taken now so how can you make decisions in areas without any noise monitoring.	
Your answer to noise monitoring now, completely misrepresents the facts. Noise monitoring now will NOT overestimate noise levels. You seem to have	



Question/Comment	Airservices Response
purposefully misinterpreted the requirement. The gathering of as comprehensive a data base as possible is very obviously more valuable than limiting the noise monitoring to a very limited time slot and data points. Why not measure as much as possible as soon as possible?	
Your explanation re noise monitoring at full capacity to assess the previous modelling is understood. If modelling is undertaken now it provides an opportunity to measure the ambient noise level while the traffic is low.	
You can monitor either side of the flight for noise monitoring	<p>We will identify appropriate sites for the short-term noise monitors to ensure that they effectively capture reliable data from arriving and departing aircraft.</p> <p>Monitoring locations need to be under the actual flight paths to ensure the data is reliable. More information on how we determine sites for noise monitors is on our website.</p> <p><a href="https://www.airservicesaustralia.com/community/environment/aircraft-noise/monitoring-aircraft-noise/">https://www.airservicesaustralia.com/community/environment/aircraft-noise/monitoring-aircraft-noise/</a></p>
There are no noise monitors that we are aware of at all in Cooroibah/Tinbeerwah. How can you state EIS for noise when it wasn't completed?	<p>Our reference to noise monitors was regarding the ambient noise monitoring undertaken by Sunshine Coast Council as part of the Sunshine Coast Council Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). For more information and to view the locations visit <i>Volume B Chapter B15 Noise and Vibration</i> and <i>Volume D Chapter D3 Aircraft Noise</i>.</p> <p><a href="https://www.statedevelopment.qld.gov.au/coordinate-general/assessments-and-approvals/coordinated-projects/completed-projects/sunshine-coast-airport-expansion/eis-documents">https://www.statedevelopment.qld.gov.au/coordinate-general/assessments-and-approvals/coordinated-projects/completed-projects/sunshine-coast-airport-expansion/eis-documents</a></p> <p>Airservices does not currently have long-term or short-term noise monitors located at the Sunshine Coast. We will be using short-term noise monitors as part of this PIR.</p> <p>Environmental Assessments use noise modelling to assess the expected impact of future changes to aircraft operations.</p>
What does that mean?	Unclear what this question refers to.
What is an N60 contour??	When talking about aircraft noise, we can provide information in several ways.
Why is it limited to N60?	
	We typically look at aircraft noise levels at 70 decibels (dB(A)) and above (this will generally make a conversation indoors difficult), and/or above 60 dB(A) (this would affect conversation outdoors).

Question/Comment	Airservices Response
	<p>We can also provide a single noise event contour (line) that shows where <i>the maximum</i> noise at that level is expected to be for the loudest aircraft footprint. This is a <math>L_{Amax}</math> noise contour for noise levels at or above 60dB(A).</p> <p>We can also provide the 'Number Above' contour which shows <i>the number</i> of aircraft events expected to occur above 60 dB(A). This is known as a N60 contour.</p> <p>60 dB(A) is used as it equates to the indoor design guide level of 50 dB(A) specified in the Australian Standard (AS2021:2015 <i>Acoustics – Aircraft noise intrusion – Building siting and construction</i>) for sleeping areas (with windows open).</p>
Noise "smoothing?"	Unclear what this question refers to.
But you should be measuring $L_{Amax}$ not just noise contours. Noise contours misrepresent noise impacts.	The PIR noise analysis will consider $L_{Amax}$ for specific, representative aircraft types as well as N60 and N70 noise contours.
misrepresentative of impacts on the community. $L_{Amax}$ is a more important measure.	
How long will you monitor noise levels?	Short-term noise monitors can be deployed for a limited period, typically three months. The exact length of time will be determined as part of PIR Phase 2.
Will there be community consultation and agreement as to the location of noise monitors?	Yes, potential noise monitoring locations will be identified in consultation with the community. This will occur in the PIR Phase 2.
It is concerning that ASA are choosing to limit noise monitoring to the N60 contour as this will not capture the full noise exposure experience/ disturbance in all newly affected areas.	As part of our environmental impact assessments, we model N60 and N70 contours. This is why these metrics are used in the PIR - so we can compare the actual noise levels against the modelled forecast.
I concur with the above comments on noise monitoring.... the EIS N60 is inaccurate so should not necessarily be taken as correct ..... it was modelled on the 737 and actual noise levels are currently much higher	<p>The purpose of the short-term noise monitoring program is to gather actual noise data to compare to forecast noise levels in the EIA. We install noise monitors within the N60 contours so we can collect data to undertake this comparison.</p> <p>As part of PIR Phase One, we will undertake modelling of current noise impacts based on actual movement data (noting this will be limited to current COVID-19 impacted operations) including types of aircraft. This will pick up all areas affected by current movement.</p> <p>If modelling indicates an N60 contour that is not consistent with our EIA modelling, we will use that</p>
No.... only monitoring N60 and N70 contours are not good enough!!! The noise pollution from planes at our property is around 58dB and it severely impacts on our mental wellbeing everytime a flight goes over!!	
Agree N60 and N70 modelling and measurement is completely inadequate and completely	
With the N60 and N70 corridors will you take these in locations regardless of frequency of flights e.g. will you take noise monitoring in both the coastal and hinterland areas regardless if there are 14 movements a day or two movements a day. All overflown areas require assessment.	

Question/Comment	Airservices Response
	as the basis for identifying potential noise monitoring locations.
Noise modelling is also based on misinformation in the EIS which is that departing aircraft will stay on a 'flight path'. This is clearly not the case - in fact, they are not required to stay on any path. How will this be addressed given what we now know?	<p>The Airservices EIA modelled aircraft noise and operations for aircraft using the Instrument Flight Procedures. Aircraft operating using Visual Flight Rules (VFR) were not modelled as part of this EIA as they do not use these instrument flight paths.</p> <p>We will provide information on where general aviation operations are occurring during the PIR.</p> <p>Where there are patterns of non-adherence to the published flight paths by aircraft flying Instrument Flight Rules, we will investigate with air traffic control (ATC) and with the airlines, and provide information on the findings and any possible improvements as part of the PIR.</p>
What else is possible and greater?	Unsure what this question relates to.
If noise abatement flight path are submitted in areas not being monitored how will you make decisions about the impact changes to the community?	<p>Airservices regularly investigates community suggested improvements to the operation of the flight paths and procedures it has implemented, including Noise Abatement Procedures. Our established process for these investigations will be applied as part of this PIR (see Section 9 of draft ToR).</p> <p>If a suggested improvement is not safe and operationally compliant, it will not progress further and the reasons will be shared with the community.</p> <p>We will undertake noise modelling if a suggested alternative is found to be feasible. We do not need noise monitoring to complete this assessment or to consider improvements suggested by the community.</p>
Also were noise levels monitored based on the height at which they have been flown over these areas? Planes coming in to land and on taking off are very different noise levels to higher heights of aircraft of flight paths?	The noise modelling considers the impact of terrain on the relative altitude of the operations so the impact of being at a higher elevation is factored in.
Suburbs at elevated levels were not considered	<p>Noise modelling for the Airservices EIA took into account the different vertical profiles for arriving and departing aircraft. The EIA assumptions (Appendix A) included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• arrivals to adopt 3 degree continuous descent</li> <li>• standard INM departure profiles (7% for Airbus A320-200 and Boeing 737-800).</li> </ul>
Noise monitoring needs to be taken from high altitudes where residents live in the Hinterland!	
Yes, [name removed] but ONLY for elevated sites that are in the N60s ? If elevated areas weren't in an N60 in the EIS, what then?	
Noise monitors won't fix the solution. Elevated areas need to be considered. You say it is but it isn't.	

Question/Comment	Airservices Response
Flight path from Sunshine Coast airport shows level at 2000ft on approach over Eumundi/Doonan. Was it taken into consideration we are already 740ft above sea level putting aircraft below 1300ft on approach and departure..?	The EIA used NASA Shuttle Radar Topography Mission terrain data to inform its modelled assumptions (Appendix A).
Yes and also at Yandina Creek we are elevated where these planes have been coming in to land how does that work? Is elevation taken in to account with height of flight paths and noise levels?	PIR modelling of current noise impacts will be based on actual movement data with consideration of altitude and terrain.
The impact from a higher altitude is far greater!	
The purpose of noise monitoring now is to get accurate data on noise impacts for each flight and by flight and aircraft type. It seems that you are purposefully trying to misunderstand the benefits of a comprehensive data set of noise impacts. There are no disadvantages of gathering comprehensive data sets. There are very clear negatives from limiting data sets	<p>We will commence noise monitoring as soon as we can be confident of a stable traffic pattern that will provide representative data. In the meantime, we can provide modelled data on noise impacts since runway opening.</p> <p>Noise monitoring information is not about capturing individual aircraft noise data, but rather representative noise data over time.</p> <p>We will keep the community updated on our noise monitoring strategy for Sunshine Coast including community engagement on the potential sites for the short-term noise monitors.</p>
ANEF is a land use planning tool. It is not an impact assessment tool.	<p>The Australian Noise Exposure Forecast (ANEF) is a land use planning document used by airports (generally federally leased) as part of their master planning process. ANEFs are also by land use planning authorities, including Councils.</p> <p>ANEFs are not use in EIAs of flight path changes undertaken by Airservices.</p>
The ANEF is a land use planning tool for areas in the immediate vicinity of the airport and in no way speaks to the noise exposure for communities outside the airport environs.	
Resisting comprehensive data set development is not constructive.	Comment noted.
Who are ASA's noise monitoring experts?	<p>Airservices employs qualified and experienced noise and environmental engineers and other specialists who conduct the environmental assessments and review noise monitoring data.</p> <p>Airservices uses an external consultant for installing the temporary noise monitors we use for PIRs. Airservices noise specialists will complete the PIR noise modelling and monitoring analysis work.</p> <p>The PIR will not include any external organisation, agency or group other than for this installation of temporary noise monitors.</p> <p>Airservices conducts PIRs of flight paths (in accordance with Airservices' National Operating Standard (NOS) <i>Environmental Management of</i></p>
Will ASA be engaging an acoustic consultant/engineer for the noise modelling exercise or does ASA have in-house expertise for this?	
Are the SME's peer reviewed?	
There needs to be an independent peer review of internal ASA noise monitoring.	
Where is the independent decision making process being implemented with your in house personnel making the decisions independently?	

Question/Comment	Airservices Response
	<p><i>Changes to Aircraft Operations (AA-NOS-ENV-2.100).</i></p> <p>As this is an Airservices business process, it does not require independent decision makers.</p> <p>The ANO will continue to monitor this process in accordance with the ANO Charter.  <a href="https://ano.gov.au/about/docs/ANO_charter_2020.pdf">https://ano.gov.au/about/docs/ANO_charter_2020.pdf</a></p>

## 2.3. Sunshine Coast Council Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

Question/Comment	Airservices Response
Who will be reviewing the EIS?!?	An EIS was prepared by Sunshine Coast Council and received approval from the Queensland State Coordinator-General in May 2016.
Can ASA tell us who they/we need to engage to have another EIS that is appropriate to the new flight path areas?	
Too right! A review to address Community Concerns needs to focus on the EIS and parameters of Assessment, but Flight Services' terms of reference won't include those. It seems the Coordinator General's rubber stamp is what needs to be reviewed - as all other authorities have treated that stamp as an ambit/wholesale endorsement with a bright green light to proceed.	<p>The Queensland State Coordinator-General is responsible for any review and compliance activities related to the approved EIS.</p> <p>Review of the EIS is not part of the scope of the PIR.</p>
The problem with limiting it to the N60 which came from the EIS, but not reviewing the EIS, means you are (by definition) building in any flawed assumption (of which there are many) from the EIS	
Can we please have absolute clarity that review of either EIS or EIA to assess conflicts of interest, omissions, errors, or misrepresentations is being excluded from the reviews? If so, is what measures, reviews or oversights are proposed to avoid future EIS and EIA once again being funded, promoted and prosecuted by proponents - thus leaving conflicts of interest and insufficient consultations to recur indefinitely into the future.	<p>We will use the findings of the PIR to improve our processes, including the conduct of EIAs if appropriate.</p> <p>Airservices completed a targeted EIA, which included a range of assumptions that were updated from the EIS. We did not rely on the noise contours from the EIS but reviewed our noise assessment findings against those in the EIS.</p>
What process will ASA follow if noise impact assumptions are found to be incorrect when compared against actual measured noise levels?	
In a nutshell, the PIR will only review the existing assumptions, such as the previous N60/N70 contours, but not to identify whether the incremental noise impact beyond the mapped paths plotted for the EIS/EIA and prior assumption dictated for analysis (at the time of the EIS and subsequent publication of EIA).	<p>The PIR includes a review of the assumptions used for noise modelling and the forecast noise levels against actual aircraft movement data and noise levels post-implementation. We do this to verify assumptions made about potential environmental and community impacts.</p> <p>The actual noise monitoring will show where the N60 and N70 noise contours are.</p>



Question/Comment	Airservices Response
	<p>We do not model the percentage of difference in noise that a community may be exposed to outside of the N60 contours.</p> <p>We will publish a report on the findings, including any differences in the modelled vs measured data and will update community information accordingly. The purpose of noise modelling and noise monitoring is to provide information on aircraft noise events.</p> <p>Where differences are found between modelled and actual noise levels, we will seek to identify the reason and will identify any actions that might be feasible to improve noise outcomes.</p> <p>There are no Australian regulations, which specify a maximum allowed level of aircraft noise over a community.</p>
Agree re. EIA. Lake Cooroibah and Noosa North Shore were not included in the original.	<p>The Sunshine Coast Council EIS included the locations of Cooroibah, Noosa North Shore, Weyba Downs (Section D5). Information was provided on expected aircraft operations.</p> <p>Airservices EIA included the locations of Cooroibah, Noosa North Shore, Weyba Downs and other areas north of Coolum. Information was provided on the location of flight paths and noise contours (Section 6), changes in daily flight numbers (Section 7) and population analysis (Section 10).</p> <p>As part of the EIA, a search was conducted on Matters of National Environmental Significance (MNES) and other environmental matters (Section 9).</p> <p>The search identified the Lake Weyba Wetlands, Cooroibah Environmental Reserve Nature Refuge, Noosa North Shore Nature Refuge and a number of other parks and wetlands.</p> <p>The EIA included an analysis of the number of flights that would operate in these areas.</p>
Nor was anywhere north of Coolum inc Lake Weyba - a new EIS is vital	
Where is the EIS for the area under these flight paths?	
Doesn't exist	Comment noted.
The noise levels will change, no matter how many aircrafts there are flying.	Comment noted.
Still unclear about Terms of Reference (TOR) relating to EIA implications. Can you elaborate on any scope in TOR for the EIA?	<p>The PIR will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desktop noise modelling comparing actual operations against modelled/forecast operations, including updated assumptions based on the closure of Runway 18/36.</li> </ul>



Question/Comment	Airservices Response
	<p>Based on the outcomes of the desktop noise modelling review, a short-term noise monitoring program will be implemented.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review of EIA community information against actual noise outcomes to confirm the accuracy of the information provided and opportunities to improve information provision to the community</li> <li>• Updated analysis of aircraft movement details based on actual aircraft operation, including tracking, altitude, NAPs adoption and compliance.</li> </ul>
<p>Will you assure that the most impacted by all of these flight paths and aircraft are made a priority? Re number of flights planned height of aircraft noise levels in areas where it was totally tranquil and wildlife including koalas are there?</p>	<p>Modelling of noise impacts based on actual aircraft movements will be completed as a single piece of work, and shared with all areas of the community at the same time.</p> <p>Consideration of community suggested alternatives will also be completed, treating all locations equally.</p> <p>Noise monitoring locations will be selected in consultation with the community.</p>
<p>I think we must remember that the ANO found the initial EIS be substantially flawed and so unfortunately Air Services and all of us are trying to fix something that is based on false premises and misinformation</p>	<p>This statement is not accurate. This was no finding in the ANO report determining the EIS as flawed.</p> <p>The ANO recommendation reference to the EIS is:</p> <p><i>Airservices should, as soon as practicable, design an effective post-implementation review (PIR) process for the Sunshine Coast flight path designs, that does not perpetuate design constraints requiring alignment with</i></p> <p><i>EIS concepts, and which encompasses:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>a) consideration of identified community - suggested alternatives</i></li> <li><i>b) a community engagement process that provides for genuine opportunities for community contributions to influence decisions</i></li> <li><i>c) application of the latest version of Airservices' National Operating Standard (NOS) Environmental Management of Changes to Aircraft Operations (AA-NOS-ENV-2.100).</i></li> </ul> <p>The EIS reference in the recommendation is interpreted to mean that any consideration of community suggested alternatives, as well as community engagement contributions, should not be viewed against the concept flight path corridors identified in the EIS, but as opportunities to create improvements unconstrained by the EIS concepts.</p>

Question/Comment	Airservices Response
	This is how this recommendation is being applied through the PIR.

## 2.4. Environmental impacts other than noise

Question/Comment	Airservices Response
Was there an environment report into our water supply from plane emissions.	<p>A review of Aircraft Operations and Emissions was conducted as part of the EIS (Volume D Chapter 4) <a href="https://www.statedevelopment.qld.gov.au/coordinate-general/assessments-and-approvals/coordinated-projects/completed-projects/sunshine-coast-airport-expansion/eis-documents">https://www.statedevelopment.qld.gov.au/coordinate-general/assessments-and-approvals/coordinated-projects/completed-projects/sunshine-coast-airport-expansion/eis-documents</a></p> <p>Research regarding the impacts of aircraft operations on water supply indicate that emissions levels being emitted by aircraft are low in comparison to emissions from cars and other industry, and that the contribution, even in the vicinity of the airport, is negligible.</p> <p>Local government has guidance on the requirements for managing the quality of tank water, especially if it is for drinking purposes.</p>
Was there are environmental study into our wildlife?	<p>The approved EIS assessed the impacts of the Sunshine Coast Airport Expansion Project on flora and fauna.</p> <p>As part of the Airservices EIA, a search was conducted on Matters of National Environmental Significance and other environmental matters (Section 9). The search identified threatened and migratory species.</p> <p>The EIA included information on the potential impacts of aircraft noise on a number of animals and migratory birds and found that no significant impacts (within the meaning of the <i>EPBC Act</i>) were considered likely to occur.</p>
What about the ground parrot that are very endangered that are caged in with fences around sunshine coast airport and cannot get away from this this massive noise and toxic pollution because they can't fly caged in like a zoo animal in their natural habitat. Who is monitoring this cruelty to animals?	Please refer on airport matters to Sunshine Coast Airport.
And also those same emissions and noise cause on the health and wellbeing of wildlife, animals, children, dogs which are also addressed and documented in WHO report and Health... Disease to dogs, dyslexia in children, mental disorders, heart attacks, strokes under flight paths	Australia is a member of the International Civil Aviation Organisation (ICAO) which has the Committee on Aviation Environmental Protection (CAEP). The CAEP monitors the emerging scientific studies in relation to the health impacts of aircraft noise. ICAO does not currently support the World

Question/Comment	Airservices Response
Noise also has a huge impact on mental health as per ombudsman commission report and also WHO report	Health Organization (WHO) recommendations on aircraft noise exposure levels, which were recommendations for Europe not global recommendations.  We will continue to monitor the work of the CAEP and should ICAO recommend further mitigations on human health impacts these will be considered by Australia, as a member State.
Who here demands this noise levels are monitored now before more and more aircraft come and impact our health and wellbeing?	
I would like to see your response on mental health if you say you will follow that advice. Thanks	

## 2.5. Operations

Question/Comment	Airservices Response
What about curfew?	Airservices does not implement or monitor airport curfews and as such, this is not part of the PIR scope. Sunshine Coast Airport is a 24/7 airport and does not have defined hours of operation.
Curfew not included. However, the EIS stated certain operational hours, these have now been ignored and substantially expanded.	
What about undocumented Alliance flights?	
Aircraft noise and volume of noise are two different things. Are you suggesting that different aircraft models (i.e. different Airbus? Boeing Jets - noise abated) are now being used and Virgin and JetStar aren't using the aircraft listed in the EIS and models?	The PIR reviews the current operations against the modelled noise forecast and related assumptions in the EIA. This includes aircraft movement data, including type and frequency of operations. We will provide information on current operations including those during COVID19 and this will include the operations Alliance has been conducting.  The number, type, destination and origin of aircraft planned to operate on each flight path is determined by a range of factors including airport and airline agreements, airline and operator flight scheduling, and fleet mix. This changes over time as new agreements are signed, schedules are updated and airlines purchase new aircraft.  Our EIA was modelled on the assumptions (Appendix A) about expected or forecast aircraft fleet, movements and schedules available at the time of writing. It is expected that there will be some changes in actual operations when compared to these assumptions and this information will be updated as part of the PIR.  We will report on the actual operations, the reasons for any differences and, where required, provide updated information to the community (including information on noise levels).  We will provide updated information on the noise levels through the noise modelling and noise monitoring. These will be using dB(A).
As far as I know no carter has bought a whole new fleet and still using the same aircraft for this route. So noise PER aircraft is a valid basis for modelling. If the fleets have change so much then the EIA and EIA must be invalid now.	

Question/Comment	Airservices Response
Our urgency is the low flying aircraft over residents home into Sunshine Coast airport. We are in the line of flights from Brisbane and we have dealt with that reluctantly since the new runway in Brisbane. But a double up is environmentally damaging.	There is a 'corridor' of operations for high-level aircraft arriving to and departing from Brisbane, which is located to the west of the Sunshine Coast airport.
Why do we now have a greater number of aircraft flying over the Hinterland from Brisbane? Why are they not flying over the ocean as they were previously. When they do fly over the ocean their altitude is a lot higher than over the Hinterland and we seem to now also have the disadvantage of elevation!!	Following the opening of the new parallel runway in Brisbane, the arrival corridor was changed and is wider. Operations from the north and west of Brisbane Airport arrive to and depart from the new parallel runway. Some operations track out over the water before crossing back over land at higher levels while other operate to the west of the Sunshine Coast Airport.
Air traffic from Brisbane should also abide by the same outcomes due to the aircraft now using the new sc air paths!	Communities in the Sunshine Coast hinterland and to the west may notice these changes at levels above 14,000ft.
Thank you. I know Brisbane is 20,000ft above. It's the planes below 1300ft over homes.	Jet air traffic from Brisbane Airport to Sunshine Coast Airport use the published flight paths.
Please do look at flights from Brisbane as they are relentless and LOW FLYING at all times over us here in the Hinterland. Why are they choosing to fly over us now, when they should be using their previous flight paths over the ocean???	General aviation operations that operate outside the Sunshine Coast Tower airspace do not receive an ATC service.
Thank you. I can certainly provide you with MANY screen shots of flights from Brisbane over us here in Hinterland elevated positions. Please just let me know where to send them!	Queries regarding aircraft operations, including general aviation and high-level operations can be directed to the Noise Complaints and Information Service. <a href="https://www.airservicesaustralia.com/community/environment/aircraft-noise/about-making-a-complaint/">https://www.airservicesaustralia.com/community/environment/aircraft-noise/about-making-a-complaint/</a>
* Flights from Brisbane & the new runway!	The changes to support Brisbane new runway that were in the area new Sunshine Coast were related to changes to high level routes, with noise levels not expected to exceed 60 dB(A), and no increase in total aviation noise.
Certainly Not flying at higher level!! Why were we not consulted about the widening of the 'Flight Corridor'? Are we supposed to just now 'live with it'??	Comment noted.
That is what I have discovered [name removed] too	The decision to close Runway 18/36 is not part of Airservices role.
Why was runway 18/16 closed??? doesn't make sense to build a new runway to expand the airports capabilities then close one of the runways??	Sunshine Coast Airport provided information on the closure of Runway 18/36 as part of their Master Planning process. <a href="https://www.sunshinecoastairport.com.au/corporate/masterplan2040/">https://www.sunshinecoastairport.com.au/corporate/masterplan2040/</a>
Runway 18/16 should not have been closed!	As part of the PIR, we will review the modelled noise forecast and associated assumptions against
Closure of 18/16 has become an excuse!!	

Question/Comment	Airservices Response
	actual operations. This will identify any changes to this forecast based on the closure of Runway 18/36.
<p>Last night a flight (JQ797) departed in a north west direction from the airport and banked to the south west at 10pm ASA has informed us that this flight path is not feasible. Obviously the planes can fly this direction.</p> <p>Hey [name removed] - I'd be interested in any data you have from that JQ797 flight last night</p> <p>Interesting to see the 'new' South West flight path being used for the first time last night by flight JQ797 to Melbourne. Given that ASA has previously stated that this flight path is not feasible.</p>	<p>We have investigated flight JQ797, and the flight deviated from the expected area of operations because of severe storm weather. This was outside tower hours and the aircraft was not under ATC instruction at that time. This decision by the pilot in command of the aircraft was required to ensure safety of the aircraft.</p> <p>During periods of bad weather, aircraft may need to divert off the approved flight paths to avoid storm cells, heavy rain and dangerous cloud formations.</p> <p>Sometimes this bad weather is not in your local area but it can be detected many nautical miles away by weather radar systems that are installed in modern aircraft.</p>
<p>Sorry, what do you mean WHERE the aircraft are flying? Aren't they supposed to be on flight paths?</p>	<p>The term 'flight path' is used to refer to the published three-dimensional corridor where aircraft typically fly. Actual aircraft operations can be a number of kilometres wide for a range of reasons, rather than the single lines depicted on flight charts (maps).</p> <p>Aircraft may fly differently within these corridors due to aircraft performance (including type, speed and weight) and the type of navigation systems used.</p> <p>Aircraft may deviate from flight paths for a range of reasons, including weather and operational requirements. In controlled airspace, this will be at the approval of ATC.</p> <p>Outside controlled airspace, aircraft do not need an ATC clearance and do not have to fly on published flight paths.</p>

## 2.6. Aircraft noise information and regulation

Question/Comment	Airservices Response
<p>Would Airservices participate in the ExPlane register of aviation noise as some international airports are now doing? <a href="https://explane.org/">https://explane.org/</a></p> <p>Thanks [name removed], then I suggest this community start using ExPlane as this community might not feel that the legislated body is acting in our interests.</p> <p>Could you clarify whether ASA's Noise and Flight Path Monitoring System (NFPMS - collecting data</p>	<p>Airservices provides a Noise and Flight Path Monitoring System (NFPMS), which collects noise and flight path data from Australian airports. This system operates 24-hours-a-day, seven-days-a-week, collecting data from every aircraft operating to and from the airport. It is publicly available on our website at <a href="https://www.airservicesaustralia.com/community/environment/aircraft-noise/monitoring-aircraft-noise/">https://www.airservicesaustralia.com/community/environment/aircraft-noise/monitoring-aircraft-noise/</a></p>

Question/Comment	Airservices Response
<p>from every aircraft operating to and from an airport) covers the Sunshine Coast?</p>	<p>In other countries, noise monitoring and aircraft movement data is not provided by the air navigation service provider and is the responsibility of airports. Therefore, some of these locations utilise ExPlane for this data. As Australia has a comprehensive NFPMS provided by Airservices, ExPlane is not required.</p> <p>Our NFPMS was originally established to monitor operations at major airports across Australia and relies upon obtaining the details of aircraft operations from lodged flight plans. Over time, the NFPMS has expanded to include other airports in Australia's main cities, within 50km of the main airport (such as Sunshine Coast Airport). However, the source radar data for these cities is still obtained from the main city airport, in this case Brisbane Airport. This can result in data gaps, but as these data gaps occur randomly throughout the day, the data while incomplete, still provides a representative picture of the weekly, hourly and day/night distribution of aircraft operations.</p> <p>The NFPMS can correlate data for aircraft that have submitted a flight plan. As many general aviation operations do not, we cannot guarantee the accuracy of the data obtained for these operations, but provide it to indicate the type and volume of operations.</p>
<p>It is not purely about impacts of the quantity of flights. Qualitative data gathered on existing flights is also relevant.</p>	<p>The PIR includes collection of qualitative data including community suggestions for noise improvements based on their experience of current operations.</p> <p>We will also obtain feedback from airlines, industry representative bodies, Sunshine Coast Airport and general aviation operators and ATC.</p> <p>We will consider all feedback from the range of stakeholders.</p>
<p>Webtrak is inaccurate</p>	<p>Data for major airports captured by WebTrak undergoes a daily checking process by our data service provider. This means that data in replay mode (the day after) will be more accurate than in current flight mode.</p> <p>For movements to and from major airports, the lateral accuracy (where an aircraft is over the ground) of WebTrak is dependent on the radar information the system uses. Radar can be inaccurate by small distances, depending on the aircraft's distance from the radar and the type of aircraft movement. Airservices performance criteria</p>



Question/Comment	Airservices Response
	<p>for radar include thresholds for margins of error (tolerances).</p> <p>WebTrak 'smooths' readings from individual radar points to show a consistent track. For scheduled flights, which perform smooth turns, the lateral accuracy is better than 250 metres at 40 kilometres from the radar site. For aircraft that make tight turns (for example, aerobatic aircraft or helicopters), the lateral accuracy is 450 metres at 40 kilometres from the radar site. This means that aircraft may not have flown exactly on the track shown on WebTrak.</p> <p>Height information is derived from changes in air pressure recorded by aircraft in flight. This is corrected for pressure variations at the ground during the flight. The margin of error using this method is 125 feet—so that at any one point, the aircraft may have been 125 feet higher or lower than the altitude shown on WebTrak. However, extreme weather conditions that cause rapid changes in pressure, such as the approach of a cold front, can further affect the accuracy of aircraft height measurements.</p> <p>In extreme cases, WebTrak can give the impression that an aircraft has deviated off the runway. This is due to radar reflections that can occur at low altitudes.</p>
If Airservices has no powers of enforcement for poor airmanship, then who does, or can pilots do what ever they feel like without bearing the consequences?	The Civil Aviation Safety Authority (CASA) is the Australian safety regulator. It sets down rules that pilots, aircraft operators and ATC must comply with. This includes regulations for how low aircraft can fly and how they must safely operate. CASA has a number of pilot education programs on Airmanship.
Yes but ASA is fully responsible for the environmental impact assessment for flight paths	Airservices is responsible for conducting environmental assessments and consideration of social impacts for flight path changes we implement (in accordance with Airservices' National Operating Standard (NOS) <i>Environmental Management of Changes to Aircraft Operations</i> (AA-NOS-ENV-2.100)).
And social impacts	

## 2.7. General comments

Question/Comment	Airservices Response
[name removed] it is up to each and everyone of us to change this ....each one of these people is just like us...they are only following man made rules and regulations and policies made by a few on behalf supposedly of all of our wellbeing ...paperwork ... we all ultimately have hearts and are living with planet Earth our home ... this is all impacting on the	Comment noted.

Question/Comment	Airservices Response
Earth too from the bigger picture We chose to live in nature in paradise.	
We didn't choose to live in a flight path... We can't even hear or see our neighbours now we have planes flying low over our home...	Comment noted.
This is also for people's children future and the future of their home	Comment noted.
I meant frequency of noise is not noise level.	Comment noted.
WOW look at that phenomenal sunset and the cicadas are singing their mating call.	Comment noted.
What a sad night to even be having this discussion.	Comment noted.
Thank You Aircraft Services Australia	Comment noted.
My letter from ASA politely telling me they may not take any more complaints from me?	<p>All complaints are registered and recorded. Where we have provided all available information, and are not able to resolve a complaint, we are honest about this and advise the complainant that we are not able to assist any further. We will however respond to any new information or complaints about other matters.</p> <p>More information on the complaint handling process is available in our FAQs on our website.  <a href="https://www.airservicesaustralia.com/community/environment/aircraft-noise/about-making-a-complaint/">https://www.airservicesaustralia.com/community/environment/aircraft-noise/about-making-a-complaint/</a></p> <p>All complaint handling processes must include a closure loop. We note on our website:</p> <p><i>If we cannot identify any way to solve your problem we will be clear and honest with you about this and we will explain the reasons why. Once we have done so, and have provided you with all relevant information, we may advise you that we would not expect to respond to you again on that issue.</i></p>
Why did air service's state to me they may not accept anymore complaints from me?	
Your last letter told me to stop complaining politely.....	
End of the day a solution needs to be done ASAP for all. The longer this drags on the more potential damage is done. So after all this talk. What can we do to save our once 'tranquil' hinterland.	We will commence Phase One of the PIR in February 2021, including the review of community suggested alternatives.
Why' wasn't this considered until we brought it to your attention?	Unsure what this question relates to.
We need a solution for all and not put it in anyone's else's backyard. My recent video of plane approach to Sunshine Coast showed a bird narrowly missing a jets engine. The environment impact can potential damage the wildlife. That is a worry	Comment noted.

## 2.8. Council involvement

Question/Comment	Airservices Response
What could it be like for us all who are under flight paths to have a meeting with those responsible at Sunshine Coast Council? [names removed] and others..	The Airport and elected representatives are stakeholders in the PIR. They are invited to participate or observe all of our community engagement activities.
Addition to from previous question ...What could it be like to us all under flight paths have a meeting with Sunshine Coast Airport [names removed] and others responsible there? Also with our representative from Council [name removed] our representative here at Division 9 and others who are representative of others who are under the flight paths?	The Airport hosts the Community Aviation Forum which is another mechanism to submit feedback on aircraft operations.

### 3. DEFINITIONS

Term	Definition
AEDT	Aviation Environmental Design Tool
ANEF	Australian Noise Exposure Forecast
ANO	Aircraft Noise Ombudsman
ATC	Air traffic control
CAF	Community Aviation Forum
CASA	Civil Aviation Safety Authority
CEF	Community Engagement Framework
dB(A)	Decibels adjusted
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
EPBC Act 1999	Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (Cth)
IAP2	International Association of Public Participation
IFR	Instrument Flight Rules
INM	Integrated Noise Model
NAPs	Noise Abatement Procedures
NFPMS	Noise and Flight Path Monitoring System
NOS	National Operating Standard
PIR	Post Implementation Review
ToR	Terms of Reference
VFR	Visual Flight Rules