



Sydney Airport Community Forum

Document: 2003/064

Issued: 25 June 2003

SYDNEY AIRPORT COMMUNITY FORUM

36th Meeting

**Conference Room A, 8th Floor,
70 Phillip Street, Sydney NSW 2000**

20 June 2003

DRAFT SUMMARY RECORD



Opening Remarks and Adoption of Agenda

The Chair opened the meeting at 9.05 am and welcomed members to the meeting.

The Chair noted the following members were represented by proxies

- The Hon Bruce Baird MP (proxy was Trent Mumford)
- Mr Joe Hockey MP (proxy was Mark Coure)
- Mr Robert McClelland MP (proxy was Christopher Connolly)
- Mr John Murphy MP (proxy was Robert Balzola)

The Chair noted apologies from Cr Vince Badalati, Mayor of Hurstville, Cr Steve Holroyd, Rockdale Council, Mr Michael Megna and Ms Sandra Nori MLA, State Member for Port Jackson.

Attachment A is a list of Members and Observers attending the meeting

Members adopted the provisional agenda without amendment.

Agenda Item 2: Confirmation of Draft Summary Record

The Draft Summary Record from the 35th Meeting on 31 March 2003 was confirmed without amendment.

Agenda Item 3: Matters arising and / or Outstanding from Previous Meeting

The Chair indicated that the Minister had not yet responded to her letter of 8 May 2003.

The Chair indicated that Items listed below would be discussed at relevant agenda items:

- Sydney Airport Master Plan - Agenda Item 4
- Relocation of the Terminal Control Unit to Melbourne - Agenda Item 5
- Noise Complaints and the Internet Usage - Agenda Item 9
- Community Advocate - Agenda Item 9

Agenda Item 4: Sydney Airport Master Plan

Ms Lisa Smith provided a report on the Community Panel process that was held on the weekend of 14 and 15 June. Details of the program are available from the Airport's Website.

Ms Smith advised that the process on the weekend went well and that the questioning from the Panel was in depth. The Panel is finalising its report but they had not yet



seen a draft report. Ms Smith expected that the report would support the maintenance of the curfew, movement cap and noise sharing principles under the Long Term Operating Plan.

The panel was divided on change to existing airport arrangements or configuration. Twelve wanted no changes while three felt that an extension to the runways and or new runways should be pursued.

The Community Panel was given a tour of the Airport prior to the session on the weekend and they asked quite incisive questions.

Ms Smith indicated that the development of any new runway would not be for the Airport to consider. Ms Smith advised that SACL was close to finalising the development of the noise contours and she envisaged circulating this noise information to Members in the near future.

Mr John Clarke represented SACF at the Community Panel. A copy of the SACF submission is attached. He indicated that the presentation to the panel went very well and that the Panel was very interested in the issues and process. Mr Clarke indicated that his presentation covered all the issues outlined in the SACF Paper, in particular that SACF supported the Long Term Operating Plan (LTOP) and that the expansion of the airport should be judged against the impact of LTOP. He also indicated that he mentioned noise insulation issues and the effects of pollution.

Mr Clarke outlined some other observations concerning the community panel and the process

- Panel members were well informed which allowed them to target questions better
- Panel members asked good questions on the issues for example noise measurement process
- Panel members would have benefited if they had supplementary information on aircraft movements and airport operations.

Mr Balzola outlined his concern that the development of the Sydney Airport Master Plan will be a repeat of the problems associated with the development of the Brisbane Airport Master Plan. Mr Balzola although supportive of the process seeing it as a productive session considered the Panel had little understanding of the Long Term Operating Plan (LTOP) and little knowledge of the master planning process.

The Chair indicated that the discussion concerning the community panel process shows that it was dynamic, evidenced by the range of views presented at SACF. The Chair also asked if the other submissions presented to the Panel would be available for viewing.

Ms Patrinos thanked SACL for giving her the opportunity to attend the process for the selection of the Community Panel.

Members were advised that Twyford Consulting were finalising the report and that it will be made available as soon as possible. It was indicated an early draft version had been prepared by the 19 June 2003



Agenda Item 4 Action 36/01: SACF to provide as soon as possible a copy of the Draft Report from Community Panel on the Master Planning Process to SACF Members.

The Chair indicated that if it was necessary then another SACF meeting could be scheduled in July to consider the report in the context of the master planning process.

Agenda Item 5: Report from the LTOP IMC, Review of LTOP and Airservices Australia Issues

Mr Hill reported on issues addressed at the recent IMC meetings. Mr Hill advised that Mr Robert McClelland MP attended this meeting.

Mr Hill indicated that movements over the north are still quite high and they are unsure how to overcome this. Another issue was the decision surrounding the different modes changes. SACF was asked to identify any specific days that give them concern and the IMC will investigate them.

It was also noted that there are still aircraft movements that impact on Kurnell and to the suburbs west of the airport especially take offs at 6am. The IMC is currently reviewing these operations.

Agenda Item 5 Action 36/02: SACF Community representative on the IMC to advise SACF on the outcomes of the review into the impacts of aircraft movements on Kurnell and the suburbs west of the airport .

Mr Hill indicated that Jim Ludlow was currently reviewing SODPROPS [Simultaneous Opposite Direction Parallel Runway Operations] and will report back to IMC at a later date.

Agenda Item 5 Action 36/03: SACF Community representative on the IMC/ Airservices Australia to advise SACF on the outcomes of the review by Mr Jim Ludlow on SODPROPS [Simultaneous Opposite Direction Parallel Runway Operations].

Airservices Australia (Airservices) indicated that a review on traffic management arrangements for Sydney Airport and that percentages to the north and mode changes will be addressed as part of this review.

Mr Balzola raised concerns from the Member for Lowe that the statistics for the north are appalling and that IMC has been a failure. He also indicated that legal action through the Federal Court may be considered if there is no improvements in the movements over the north. In addition, Mr Balzola commented on behalf of the Mr Murphy MP that the community should not have to justify the published data on



LTOP either statistically or scientifically given that it was a Government instrument / Ministerial Direction that had failed.

The Chair indicated that it is envisaged that the LTOP Review will consider the issues raised by Mr Balzola.

LTOP Review

The Chair advised that there has been a delay in LTOP Review because some Sub committee members have not yet signed their confidentiality agreements.

Mr Clarke indicated that he had some legal questions concerning the confidentiality and would like some simple statements from the Department on these questions. The Chair indicated that Members are entitled to seek their own legal advice as well.

The Chair advised that once Members sign the Deeds of Undertaking then the LTOP Review tender will be advertised.

Agenda Item 5 Action 36/04: SACF to follow up with Members on LTOP Review Sub committee to encourage them to sign their confidentiality agreements to enable the Review to proceed.

Relocation of the Terminal Control Unit to Melbourne

Mr McLean advised that Sydney Members of Parliament were appreciative of the briefing in Canberra from Airservices on this relocation of the Terminal Control Unit (TCU) to Melbourne.

Members were advised that it was only the radar unit that was moving to Melbourne and not Tower. The main issues revolve around aviation safety. Members were advised that there are no significant issues that would preclude the relocation of the TCU to Melbourne.

Mr McLean advised that its report, which will encapsulate the topics raised by the Members of Parliament and Community Groups, will go to Airservices Board for consideration by August 2003.

Members saw technical issues and the management of LTOP as matters of concern for the Forum. A view put forward at the meeting was that people who live and work in Sydney would have a better appreciation of the issues and problems affecting Sydney.

Mr Balzola raised the issue of Bankstown Airport and that its tower is not always staffed in relation to the TCU relocation. However, Mr Jensen indicated that there is no relationship between Bankstown Airport and TCU.



Emerging Aviation Technologies

No significant issues were raised on this item. Airservices advised that it closely watches the evolution of all emerging technology but indicated that GPS technology is still some way off. Airservices indicated that it will purchase GPS technology in the next few years in order to test its capabilities.

Airspace Redesign

Members did not raise any issues on this subject.

Agenda Item 6: Noise Insulation

The Chair noted that the Department's report pertaining to Action Items 21 and 22 were contained in the Noise Amelioration Report [SACF 2003/050].

Cr May questioned the Policy that if a current owner declines the offer to receive noise insulation then this prevents future owners from receiving it. Some members did not consider this as being fair for future purchasers. It was also raised that noise insulation affects property values. Other members noted that potential purchasers may check titles and the property itself to ascertain if it had been insulated or not.

Mr Hill advised that he would be meeting with Mr Southgate from the Department of Transport and Regional Services concerning the preparation of the Kurnell submission to be considered as a special case to receive noise insulation. He also indicated that Mr Bruce Baird MP is involved as similar issues affect his electorate.

Agenda Item 6 Action 36/05: DOTARS resolved to obtain clarification on the issues, particularly on what information is placed on noise certificates and to what is enforceable and by whom.

Agenda Item 6 Action 36/06: SACF to approach local councils to ascertain their requirements for the insulation of houses against noise.

Mr Hill also raised concern of the effects of the high-density residential developments that are being built under the flight paths to the north and north east of the Airport. SACF Representatives covering the suburbs of Lane Cove and Hunters Hill indicated that the Councils do not have zones for noise affected residential areas, nor notice on title.

Agenda Item 7: Noise Monitoring

Members did not raise any issues on this subject.

Agenda Item 8 Standing Operational Reports

Standing Reports

The Chair noted that a number of standing reports had been issued since the last meeting and that a number of issues were discussed during the report back from the IMC Representative.

Mr Clarke raised the issue again that SODPROPS was not used enough. The Chair noted comments but reiterated that this had been covered previously.

It was raised that the percentage of runway targets for May have not been achieved.

Members did not raise any other issues on these standing reports.

Agenda 9: SACF Correspondence and Issues Raised by the Public

Correspondence

The Chair noted the correspondence and indicated that some of it had been addressed during other agenda items. Mr Clarke raised a concern regarding the delays in the Minister's correspondence.

The Chair indicated that a number of letters were in her office for signature.

Community Advocate

The Chair noted the importance of a community advocate role.

Mr Clarke provided a report on the role of the community advocate. He raised the point that the community is not considered as a prominent stakeholder in aviation operations. The Advocate should have extensive technical knowledge pertaining to aviation issues. Mr Clarke saw the role of the community advocate as being much broader than just for Sydney Airport and that they should be independent and impartial to ensure they are useful for the community. He indicated that the Advocate has not only to be independent but be seen to be independent. In addition, establishing a Community Advocate at Sydney Airport is not setting a precedent as it occurs elsewhere overseas.

Mr Clarke tabled a Draft Position Description relating to the community advocate for consideration by SACF. Attachment B at page 19 is a copy of the position description for the Community Advocate. The Chair thanked Mr Clarke for preparing this draft document.

Airservices advised that they support the concept but that further issues need clarification before they can approve it. Airservices have offered a community audit



services to check operations. Airservices also advised that their corporate area needs to give consideration to this issue before the position is established.

Airservices highlighted that it was proud of its performance to date but that there is no harm done if the community received additional confidence through having a dedicated observer acting on their behalf.

Mr Jensen considered that the community advocate needs ample independence. Therefore, it should be part of the Department of Transport and Regional Services rather than Airservices.

***Agenda Item 9 Action 36/07:** SACF Members to provide comments to Mr Clarke and the Secretariat on his proposal of a community advocate and the associated position description.*

Airservices Noise Enquiry Service – 1800 Freecall Line

Mr McLean apologised for the change of Airservices' previous advice concerning the reintroduction of the 1800 number. Members were advised that the 1800 number encouraged bad behaviour from some callers who phoned frequently and left malicious messages. The final advice from Airservices was that the 1800 number will not be reintroduced.

The Chair acknowledged Airservices reasons for not reintroducing the Freecall service but indicated that SACF was disappointed with this decision, particularly given the encouraging advice from previous meetings.

Airservices Internet Service

Airservices have been encouraging greater Internet usage for the community to lodge complaints. Airservices indicated that they have approached local councils concerning the placement of a link to their complaints line and that there has been a mixed interest ranging from no to please discuss. At the time of the meeting some councils still had not responded to their request.

Airservices indicated that a number of advertisements had been placed in local Sydney newspapers.

SACF representatives covering the Hunters Hill and Lane Cove Councils indicated that the Council's website included links to Airservices Australia's Noise Complaints page.

***Agenda Item 9 Action 36/08:** Airservices Australia to report to SACF at the next meeting concerning the Internet usage and its advertising campaign to encourage use.*

***Agenda Item 9 Action 36/09:** Airservices Australia to approach local Sydney Members of Parliament asking them if they would advertise the URL [Uniform Resource Locator] in their electorate publications.*

Agenda Item 10: Other Business

The Chair acknowledged that Mr Balzola (representative for Mr Murphy MP, Member for Lowe) had Actions from the last meeting relating to the Sydney Airport Master Plan to discuss. The Chair indicated that the process would be handled in two steps – first the discussion on the issues followed by the Motions. Attachment C details these motions.

Mr Balzola reiterated on behalf of the SACF Member his concerns about the delay in a response from the Minister and expressed concern about the development of the Sydney Airport Master Plan.

Mr Balzola indicated in his view, that if the current process to develop the Sydney Airport Master Plan continues then the problems associated with the Brisbane Airport Master Plan will be repeated. He requested that the process be halted. He indicated that there was confusion over the master plan and other statutory obligations required during the development of the master plan. Mr Balzola emphasised that for master plans at airports to have weight then it is necessary to acknowledge the ancillary issues that have been raised.

He requested that the Minister must be informed that flaws exist in the current process for the development of airport master plans as raised by the Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport References Committee.

The Members were advised that the Minister is currently considering the recommendations raised in the Senate Report. The Department also outlined the current provisions contained in the *Airports Act 1996* which is currently under review and that 60 submissions had been received. Members were advised that the Minister set the date for the master plan but he has the authority to change the date if necessary. Members were advised that the Government had considered the recommendations on the Brisbane Airport Master Plan and that it had tabled its response. A copy is available at Attachment D.

Agenda Item 10 Action 36/10: SACF Members to receive a copy of the Government's Response on the Senate Inquiry Brisbane Airport Corporation Master Plan from the Senate Rural and Regional Affairs References Committee.

Mr Balzola made a presentation on the current legislation and the obligations it imposes on the master plan.

Cr May raised the issue of the effectiveness of the master plan once approved and whether the community's expectation will be met.

SACL representative acknowledged Mr Balzola's points concerning the recommendations that the master plan must contain but if the legislation is changed at the time of lodgement of the master plan for Ministerial approval then the current document would not reflect the changes.

SACL indicated that in five years the Corporation will have to undertake another 20 year master plan for approval and they will go through much the same process. It



was also mentioned that the master plan, movement cap and curfew are separate pieces of legislation and that they could not be seen as mutually exclusive. SACL's outlined its position regarding a second Sydney Airport which is that the current airport at Mascot can handle aircraft traffic for the next twenty years.

The Department reiterated the requirements of the *Airport Act 1996* in particular the date set for the lodgement of the master plan and that a ninety-day consultation period is required.

The suggestion was put to members that they should focus on the specific recommendations that may affect the master plan but the Chair indicated that it may not be possible to discuss in detail those recommendation at this meeting as there were six resolutions for consideration.

The Chair outlined a number of relationships that exist between the recommendations and the master plan process as well as indicating that the Government has accepted some of these.

SACL indicated that they would be happy to receive SACF's suggestion on what SACL should consider as its purpose for the master plan. SACL indicated that they can provide an explanation on linkages between major development plans and the master plan but the Government would have a different view.

Questions were raised that there did not appear to be anything in the recommendations that would specifically change the master plan. The Chair indicated that the recommendations relate overwhelmingly to the structure of the *Airports Act 1996* and not specifically to the master plan.

SACL member indicated that the current community consultation will far exceed the current legislative requirements. However, because proposed amendments to the Act are presently unknown, SACL cannot say, at this present time, whether they will be complying with them or not during this process. SACL indicated that it is not for them to say whether amendments to the Act should occur but they will endeavour to meet the requirements set down.

Agenda Item 10 Action 36/11 SACF Chair indicated that SACF can write to SACL concerning the recommendations from the Senate Inquiry into the Brisbane Airport Corporation Master Plan.

Agenda Item 10 Action 36/12 SACF can include in its submission on the master plan a request that SACL address the issues that were raised in the Senate Report.

Mr Balzola on behalf of Mr Murphy MP, Member for Lowe presented the following motions for SACF consideration.

The Chair read the following motion to Members for their consideration

Sydney Airport Community Forum request the Minister for Transport and Regional Services adopt the eight recommendations contained in the *Report on the Inquiry into*

the Development of the Brisbane Airport Corporation Master plan drafted by the Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport References Committee.

Moved by Mr Robert Balzola and seconded by Mr John Clarke.

Mr Balzola did not provide any additional discussion on this motion. Members accepted the following amendment "... adopt **by 31 December 2003** the eight recommendations ..." be included in the motion.

The motion was carried.

In light of section 70 of the Airports Act, the fact that SACL is statutorily required to have a master plan for Sydney Airport, the SACF recommend that the draft master plan process be halted until the eight recommendations as ratified by the Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport References Committee's Report on the Inquiry into the Development of the Brisbane Airport Corporation Master plan be fully implemented and made into law before the Sydney Airport master plan process is resumed.

Motion moved by Mr Balzola and seconded by Mr Alex Marchei, representative for the State Member for Lane Cove.

The meeting resolved to defer this motion until later.

***Agenda Item 10 Action 36/13.** SACF to return to this motion after Mr Balzola (representative for Mr J Murphy MP, Federal Members for Lowe) and Cr May, Mayor of Lane Cove Council to allow them to meet to discuss SACF's concerns that changes to the Airports Act are unlikely before the implementation of the SACL Master Plan.*

Following further lengthy discussion of the Senate Report's Recommendations and their relationship to the work of SACF.

The Chair put the following substantive motion that

SACF request the Minister for Transport and Regional Services adopt the recommendations 1, 2, 3, 4, 6 and 8 of the Senate Report Inquiry into the Brisbane Airport Corporation Master Plan of the Senate Rural and Regional Affairs References Committee.

The third motion from Mr Balzola was put to the meeting

SACF motion to Minister for Transport and Regional Services to ratify the status of a Master Plan as a legally binding agreement between stakeholders.

The motion lapsed.

The fourth motion from Mr Balzola was put to the meeting for consideration

Sydney Airport Community Forum request the Minister for Transport and Regional Services amend the master plan statutory process as recommended by the Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport References Committee in their Report on the Inquiry into the Development of the Brisbane Airport Corporation Master Plan.



The Chair indicated that this motion complied with the action requirements from the last meeting. Members resolved that Action 35/26 had been finalised.

The fifth motion as amended (in bold type) was discussed:

The LTOP be formally scheduled as part of the Sydney Airport Master Plan under the provisions of subsections 71(2) (f), (g) and (h) of the Airports Act.

The motion was lost.

Mr Balzola indicated the following procedural amendment (bolded) sub section 71 (2) (f), (g) (h) to the motion.

The sixth motion from Mr Balzola was put to the meeting:

Other such planning and pollution instruments under New South Wales law as determined to be relevant by the SACF be scheduled as part of the Sydney Airport Master Plan under the provisions of subsections 71 (2) (f), (g) and (h) of the Airports Act

The Chair indicated that Members may consider the following motion:

that SACF could resolve to seek advice on the issues raised in relation to planning and pollution instruments under NSW laws that may be relevant to the operation of the airport.

In conclusion, the Chair suggested the following motion for Members' consideration

That in the unavoidable absence of the Chair an existing Parliamentary member of SACF in the same party be appointed as temporary Chair to fulfil that function.

Agenda Item 10 Action 35/14: *SACF to convey the resolution that an existing Parliamentary SACF Member be appointed as a temporary Chair when the serving Chair is unavailable due to an unavoidable absences*

Date of Next Meeting

The dates of the next two meetings have been set for Friday 19 September 2003 and for Friday 12 December 2003.

Cr May on behalf of all Members thanked the Chair for attending this meeting.

Mr Jensen expressed his appreciation that the meeting demonstrated significant discipline to deal with the range of issues that were on the agenda within the specified time frame.

The meeting was closed at 12 o'clock.



Action List from the 36th Meeting of the Sydney Airport Community Forum

Agenda Item 4 Action 36/01: SACL to provide as soon as possible a copy of the Draft Report from Community Panel on the Master Planning Process to SACF Members.

Agenda Item 5 Action 36/02: SACF Community representative on the IMC to advise SACF on the outcomes of the review into the impacts of aircraft movements on Kurnell and the suburbs west of the airport .

Agenda Item 5 Action 36/03: SACF Community representative on the IMC/ Airservices to advise SACF on the outcomes of the review by Mr Jim Ludlow on SODPROPS [Simultaneous Opposite Direction Parallel Runway Operations].

Agenda Item 5 Action 36/04: SACF to follow up with Members on LTOP Review Sub committee to encourage them to sign their confidentiality agreements to enable the Review to proceed.

Agenda Item 6 Action 36/05: DOTARS resolved to obtain clarification on the issues particularly on what information is placed on noise certificates and to what is enforceable and by whom.

Agenda Item 6 Action 36/06: SACF to approach local councils to ascertain their requirements for the insulation of houses against noise.

Agenda Item 9 Action 36/07: SACF Members to provide comments to Mr Clarke and the Secretariat on his proposal of a community advocate and the associated position description.

Agenda Item 9 Action 36/08: Airservices to report to SACF at the next meeting concerning the Internet usage and its advertising campaign to encourage use.

Agenda Item 9 Action 36/09: Airservices to approach local Sydney Members of Parliament asking them if they would advertise the URL [Uniform Resource Locator] in their electorate publications.

Agenda Item 10 Action 36/10: SACF Members to receive a copy of the Government's Response on the Senate Inquiry Brisbane Airport Corporation Master Plan from the Senate Rural and Regional Affairs References Committee.

Agenda Item 10 Action 36/11: SACF Chair indicated that SACF can write to SACL concerning the recommendations from the Senate Inquiry into the Brisbane Airport Corporation Master Plan.

Agenda Item 10 Action 36/12: SACF can include in its submission on the master plan request that SACL address the issues that were raised in the Senate Report.



Agenda Item 10 Action 36/13: SACF to return to this motion after Mr Balzola (representative for Mr J Murphy MP, Federal Members for Lowe) and Cr May, Mayor of Lane Cove Council to allow them to meet to discuss SACF's concerns that changes to the *Airports Act 1996* are unlikely before the implementation of the SACL Master Plan.

Agenda Item 10 Action 36/14: SACF to convey the resolution that an existing Parliamentary SACF Member be appointed as temporary Chairperson when the serving Chairperson is unavailable due to unavoidable absences



ATTACHMENT A: Attendance

Members

M Payne	Senator for NSW, Chair
R Balzola	Representing Mr J Murphy MP, Federal Member for Lowe
W Bennett	Board of Airline Representatives in Australia
J Clarke	Representing Upper North Shore (morning session)
C Connolly	Representing Mr R McClelland MP, Federal Member for Barton
K Hill	Representing the Kurnell Community
S Hoopmann	Representing the Bennelong Community
T Jensen	Qantas Airways
A Marchi	Representative for Mr A Roberts MLA State Member for Lane Cove
J May	Mayor of Lane Cove Council
T Mumford	Representing the Hon B Baird MP, Federal Member for Cook
M Patrinos	Canterbury Residents Against Aircraft Noise
F Sinclair King	Representing the Wentworth Community
L Smith	Sydney Airport Corporations Ltd



Advisers/Secretariat

L Addison	Dept of Transport and Regional Services
D Savage	Dept of Transport and Regional Services
G Kelly	Dept of Transport and Regional Services

A Joseph	Senator Payne's Office
----------	------------------------

A But	Airservices Australia
L Joynton	Airservices Australia
L Kenna	Airservices Australia
K McLean	Airservices Australia
J Peters	Airservices Australia

A Sellick	Qantas Airways
-----------	----------------

Observers

R Bullen	Wilkinson Murray
J Dale	CAC
G Lillenthal	Observer for Cr Holroyd
JCM Jones	Clover Moore MP for Bligh



AVIATION COMMUNITY ADVOCATE

At the SACF meeting on 31 March 2003 I was asked to write to you concerning the proposal, put on my behalf by Mr Frere, to establish a position of Community Aviation Advocate. I note that SACF thought that this would be a good step towards SACF and Airservices Australia working together and that Airservices were comfortable with the position.

My concept for an Advocate is for someone who can participate and influence in ways that are of benefit to the community, the day to day discussion and activities of Airservices. They would need to be able to genuinely advance the community as an equal stakeholder in the operations of Sydney Airport.

Recognising that other airports also have noise problems caused by their operations and Airservices also have responsibilities to their surrounding communities, this role could encompass representing the community's interests at other airports as well. However, because of Sydney's unique problems the role would need to be based in Airservices offices at Sydney Airport.

The person would require a deep technical knowledge of air traffic control and Airservices' processes and procedures. I would suggest therefore that for this role either a current or past senior air traffic controller with a demonstrated commitment to achieving the best outcomes for the community would be appropriate. However, this person should also be seen by the wider community as being independent of the Airservices' chain of command, and therefore should be employed by or seconded to the Department of Transport and Regional Services.

While I am anxious to progress this as soon as possible, I would recommend that we work up a proper position description, define the reporting arrangements, remuneration and recruitment approach before suggesting names for this role. To this end I have drafted a position description, which is enclosed. I would appreciate if you could review this and feed back any comments to me.

John Clarke
Representative for the Upper North Shore
6 June 2003

POSITION DESCRIPTION

POSITION TITLE: AVIATION COMMUNITY ADVOCATE

**RESPONSIBLE TO: ASSISTANT SECRETARY AIRPORT
PLANNING AND REGULATION BRANCH**

1. PURPOSE OF POSITION

To independently represent and pursue the interests and views of the community in the conduct and planning of aviation operations, and to provide expert advice to the community on aviation matters. This role involves extensive analysis of the operational impacts of aviation on the community, and the development of initiatives to mitigate these impacts.

2. WORKING RELATIONSHIPS

Responsible to the Assistance Secretary Airport Planning and Regulation Branch for the conduct of activities in accordance with the position's agreed terms of reference.

Responsive to the Sydney Airport Community Forum.

Responsive to other community consultative forums at airports throughout Australia

Daily contact with:

- Airservices Australia
- Airport owners throughout Australia, and in particular the Sydney Airports Corporation Limited (SACL).
- Aviation Industry.
- Department of Transport and Regional Services.
- The Sydney Airport Community Forum (SACF).
- The general community impacted by airport and aircraft operations.
- Political representatives at the local, state and federal levels of government.

3. KEY RESPONSIBILITIES

Participate and influence in ways that are of benefit to the community, the day to day discussion and activities of Airservices Australia.



Build and maintain effective networks and relationships with relevant management and staff at Airservices Australia, DOTRS, airports, and with the community and their representatives.

Ongoing monitoring and review of aviation operations and the suggestion of improvements to mitigate the impact of these operations on the community.

Participate in formal reviews, working groups and taskforces on airports and aviation operations, as required.

Provide expert advice to Sydney Airport Community Forum, the community members on the Implementation and Monitoring Committee (IMC) and similar community forums at other airports on operational aviation matters.

Attend meetings of the Sydney Airport Community Forum, the Implementation and Monitoring Committee (IMC) and similar forums at other airports.

Propose and undertake initiatives as required which will result in "win-win" solutions to the problems of aircraft noise.

Prepare briefs and conduct presentations.

4. EDUCATION AND EXPERIENCE

Diploma in Aviation.

Extensive Experience (min 10 years) in air traffic services and air traffic services management.

Demonstrated awareness and understanding of community issues with regards to the impacts of aviation.

Sound knowledge of current air traffic processes procedures.

Understanding and experience in the Long Term Operating Plan for Sydney Airport.

Understanding of air traffic design and the impact of emerging technologies.

Sound knowledge of computer hardware and software applications including MS Office, MS Project and the Internet

5. SKILLS REQUIRED

Highly developed written communication skills, including the analysis of policy, the development of technical documentation (procedures), report writing and briefs.



Strong oral communication and presentation skills with the ability to influence, motivate and liaise with senior management across a range of external organisations, and political representatives.

Strategic thinking and planning skills with the ability to recognise and negotiate win - win outcomes.

The ability to translate and interpret technical aviation procedures into practical impacts.

Highly developed investigative, analytical and research skills.

Very strong interpersonal skills, with the ability to develop and maintain working relationships with staff at all levels in organisations and with the general community.

The ability and desire to work with both the community and Airservices to develop better solutions for the community.

Superior planning, organising and administrative skills.

6. INDEPENDENCE OF ACTION

Required to work un-supervised with a high degree of independence and autonomy. Must be self motivated, prepared to take the initiative, set own goals and timelines.

7. WORK ENVIRONMENT

Located within Airservices Australia Sydney offices at Kingsford Smith Airport.

Will involve some travel to other airports within Australia.



Attachment C

Response to SACF Mtg 31 Mar 03 Agenda Action Items

Agenda Item 2 Action 35/6 from the 31 March 2003 meeting of the SACF

This agenda item reads:

'Mr Balzola Proxy for Mr Murphy MP to draft a motion before the next meeting of SACF outlining its concerns with the master plan process and what inclusions he may desire in the draft master plan'

The proposed motion is thus is two parts.

The first part deals with the concerns regarding the master plan process and the second part deals with the proposed inclusions in the master plan.

Draft Motions

THAT: Sydney Airport Community Forum request the Minister for Transport and Regional Services adopt the eight recommendations contained in the *Report on the Inquiry into the Development of the Brisbane Airport Corporation Master plan* drafted by the Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport References Committee.

THAT: In light of section 70 of the *Airports Act*, the fact that SACF is statutorily required to have a master plan for Sydney Airport, the SACF recommend that the draft master plan process be halted until the eight recommendations as ratified by the Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport References Committee's *Report on the Inquiry into the Development of the Brisbane Airport Corporation Master plan* be fully implemented and made into law before the Sydney Airport master plan process is resumed.

THAT: SACF motion to Minister for Transport and Regional Services to ratify status of Master Plan as a legally binding agreement between stakeholders.

Purpose

The purpose of these motions is to ensure that the errors and shortcomings as identified in the Brisbane Airport Report are accommodated for Sydney so as to not repeat history and subject the residents of the Sydney Basin to the same plight as has affected the residents of Brisbane Airport. The consequences of not applying and acting upon the Senate Committee's recommendations are serious and far reaching in their implications on the residents in the Sydney Basin.

For these reasons, these recommendations cannot be ignored and to ignore them will have serious deleterious consequences on the people of Sydney.



Agenda Item 4 Action 35/26 from the 31 March 2003 meeting of the SACF

This agenda item reads:

'SACF Chair in consultation with Mr Balzola draft a motion that outlines SACF's concerns with the master plan process and elaborate on what may be included in the draft master plan'.

At the time of writing the following motion, this draft motion is submitted to Senator the Hon Marise Payne's office for the purposes of consultation which is yet to occur.

Draft Motion

THAT: Sydney Airport Community Forum request the Minister for Transport and Regional Services amend the master plan statutory process as recommended by the Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport References Committee in their *Report on the Inquiry into the Development of the Brisbane Airport Corporation Master plan*.

THAT: The LTOP be formally scheduled as part of the Sydney Airport Master Plan under the provisions of subsections 71(f), (g) and (h) of the *Airports Act*.

THAT: Other such planning and pollution instruments under New South Wales law as determined to be relevant by the SACF be scheduled as part of the Sydney Airport Master Plan under the provisions of subsections 71(f), (g) and (h) of the *Airports Act*.

Purpose

In particular, the amendments to include close consultation between the Minister and respective Shadow Minister for the purpose of addressing the following Senate Committee concerns:

1. Relationship between master plan and ancillary instruments
2. Potential conflict of interest in differing roles of Airservices Australia
3. Ratification of preferred community consultation models

Response SACL Master Plan Methodology to date

There is little more to add above, other than to note in passing that Lisa Smith of SACL has mentioned that a new model of community consultation is being proposed in Sydney Airport which is unique and to be applied with Sydney Airport on a first-time basis.

It is also stated that the SACL presentation as tabled on 29 November 2002 and subsequent stakeholder consultations have not adequately presented the true statutory purpose of the master plan or ancillary documents.

That being said, it would appear that SACL are changing their community consultation process in line with Senate Committee Recommendation 7 (paragraph 1.29). This leaves open Recommendation 4 as to whether the Department of Transport and Regional Services has developed a set of protocols which outline the



requirements for community consultation in relation to airport master plans and major development plans and whether this achieves the desired outcomes of Recommendation 5 that a more open consultation process be reached.

It was upon discovery of this fact that led to my presentation on John Murphy's behalf which sought to address the statutory description of the nature, purpose and content of the master plan. The Senate's observations in light of the Brisbane Airport Report demonstrates the serious shortcomings of the present statutory regime such that to move forward with a master plan for Sydney Airport without fully adopting the Senate Committee's eight recommendations would, in my opinion, be gravely negligent on the part of SACF, SACL and ultimately the Minister.

The community must be better briefed as to the recommendations of the Senate Committee and the Minister ought to be urged to act upon them before the Sydney Airport master plan commences.

Conclusion

Thank you for the opportunity to present this submission on behalf of John Murphy MP.

Yours sincerely

Robert Balzola (for)
John Murphy MP
Member for Lowe



Sydney Airport Community Forum
Document: 2003/063
Issued: 25 June 2003

ATTACHMENT D

**Department of Transport and Regional Services
SENATE INQUIRY INTO THE BRISBANE MASTER PLAN**

Response of the Federal Government to the Report of the Senate Rural And Regional Affairs and Transport References Committee 'Inquiry into the Development of the Brisbane Airport Corporation Master Plan'

The Hon John Anderson MP, Deputy Prime Minister, Minister for Transport and Regional Services

The following provides the Commonwealth's response to recommendations made by the Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport References Committee report to the Government concerning the development of the Brisbane Airport Corporation's Master Plan.

Each of the Committee's recommendations is addressed in turn.

Recommendation 1 - That the *Airports Act 1996* be amended to include an object and purpose statement for airport master plans.

Section 71 of the Airports Act 1996 currently sets out clearly what is to be contained in a draft or final airport master plan. While there has been no evidence of any misunderstanding by airport operators as to the matters required to be covered in an airport master plan, the Government acknowledges that there has been confusion in the public's mind as to the purpose of such a document. Accordingly, the Government considers that a purpose statement in the legislation could prove helpful and an appropriate amendment to the legislation will be prepared.

Recommendation 2 - That the *Airports Act 1996* be amended to specify the relationship a major development plan has to a master plan.

The Government considers that some of the public concern associated with the development of the Brisbane Airport master plan reflected a lack of understanding of the status of the master plan and its relationship to major developments on airport, such as the proposed new runway. Accordingly, the Government will prepare an amendment to the legislation to clarify the relationship between airport master plans and major development plans.



Recommendation 3 - That the *Airports Act 1996* be amended to include more prescriptive requirements for community consultation by airport owners and airport-lessees.

Recommendation 4 - That DoTRS develop a set of protocols which outline the requirements for community consultation in relation to airport master plans and major development plans.

The Government recognises the legitimate expectations of communities to be consulted on the planning and development of airports and the benefits which can result from such consultation by way of better informed decision making.

The requirements under sections 79 and 92 of the Airports Act 1996 ensure that airport operators undertake a structured public consultation process as part of the master planning and major development planning process. The current framework also provides for certainty and clarity in the manner in which community comment is to be incorporated into those planning processes and reflected in the submissions to the Minister. In addition, the public is entitled to (and does) make its views known directly to the Government on particular airport planning matters. In making a decision on an airport master or major development plan the Minister takes into account comments from all the stakeholders including the community.

The Government is conscious of the costs that would arise from a highly prescriptive regulatory process covering the level, means and detail of public consultation to be undertaken and the depth and level of associated information disclosure. Moreover, stakeholders are likely to have different levels of knowledge on, and expectations about, these matters and this in itself can give rise to different impressions of how well consultation has been undertaken.

In that regard, to facilitate and improve consultation on issues that involve aircraft noise impacts, the Department has developed and released a discussion paper entitled 'Expanding Ways to Describe and Assess Aircraft Noise'. The Discussion Paper outlines a range of new graphical presentations designed to advance the way in which aircraft noise exposure is conveyed to the lay person.

The Department has also developed and made available to all major airports computer programs that enable the graphical material presented in the Discussion Paper to be readily produced for dissemination by an individual airport.

This work is designed to provide for a more inclusive and meaningful consultation process that enables affected individuals to make more informed judgements and comment. Continuing in that vein, the Government will also develop, in consultation with airport lessees, major stakeholders and public interest groups, a standard set of guidelines to promote a shared understanding for how consultation processes should be managed.

Recommendation 5 - That BAC conduct more open consultation with affected groups, including community groups.

Brisbane Airport has met the statutory requirements of the Airports Act 1996 in relation to the preparation of its master plan.



The public perception that consultation had been inadequate was largely based on concerns that approving the master plan meant that the proposed parallel runway would be built regardless of the merits of alternative options or the noise and environmental impacts on the community.

As noted by the Committee, it is the major development plan process that provides the focus for detailed scrutiny and associated community consultation in relation to individual major development proposals.

In approving the master plan, the Minister for Transport and Regional Services has emphasised his expectation that any subsequent development by Brisbane Airport of a draft major development plan for a new parallel runway would need to fully explore alternative runway options. This requirement is to provide the community with a complete and transparent process for understanding the issues arising, including the impact on local communities affected by prospective flight paths.

The Department has drawn this Recommendation to the attention of Brisbane Airport and will reflect its intention in the drafting of airport consultation guidelines.

Recommendation 6 - That the Airports Act 1996 be amended to place a responsibility on airports to disclose draft flight path information prepared by Airservices Australia to the public as part of draft master plans.

The Government is conscious of community concern about the lack of flight path information related to possible future runways in airport master plans. To provide a clear picture of aircraft noise exposure patterns, flight path information extending well beyond the Australian Noise Exposure Forecast (ANEF) contours would have to be provided.

The Airports Act 1996 requires that a draft master plan assess the extent of likely significant noise impacts by reference to ANEF contours. Preparing ANEF contours requires broad assumptions to be made about the location of flight paths within the immediate environs of an airport. It is proposed that in future the 'close in' flight paths that have been used to develop the ANEF contours will have to be shown in master planning documents and that the relationship between flight paths and ANEF contours will need to be discussed to provide a better community understanding of issues. The Government will give effect to this through amendments to the Airports Act 1996 Regulations.

The flight path assumptions which provide an acceptable basis for forecasting noise impacts on, or close to, an airport (ie for constructing ANEF contours), however, will generally not be an accurate basis for describing the likely environmental impacts on areas further away from the airport. A set of 'outer' flight paths is required for this purpose.

While it may be possible to discuss the 'outer' flight paths in broad conceptual terms in a master plan, it becomes unrealistic to attempt to depict where these may be in the future due to the significant uncertainties in the key factors that determine the location, and level of use, of flight paths. Those uncertainties, which increase as the time horizon is extended, include climatic changes, advances in future technology (both for aircraft and navigation equipment),



changes in fleet mixes and traffic demand and aircraft operating standards, and airspace design and structure.

These practical limitations mean that meaningful 'outer' flight path information should only be produced at the time when actual changes are being proposed to such flight paths such as when a draft major development plan is being prepared for a new runway. To ensure that this information is available to the public for the consultation phase in preparing such plans, the Government will amend the Airports Act 1996 Regulations to require detailed 'outer' flight path information to be produced for any future major development plan that could substantially affect aircraft flight paths.

Recommendation 7 - That BAC investigate different community consultation models in order to identify the various ways in which more effective community consultation can be conducted.

This matter will be taken up in developing airport consultation guidelines to assist airport operators in better managing their consultation processes.

Recommendation 8 - That the dual roles of Airservices Australia of government adviser and external consultant be critically examined to determine whether there is potential for conflict of interest.

The Government announced in November 1999 its intention to corporatise Airservices Australia and to introduce some measured competition to the provision of airport based air traffic control services and aviation rescue and fire fighting services.

As part of that process the Government is reviewing Airservices Australia's two regulatory functions (airspace and environmental management) to determine how they might be best undertaken post-corporatisation. This examination will take into account potential conflicts of interest and the need for any protocol arrangements to separate commercial from regulatory functions. In the meantime Airservices Australia has initiated its own internal procedures to formalise its approach to the avoidance of conflict of interest situations.

Recommendation 9 - That a noise amelioration program, similar to that announced by the Minister for Transport and Regional Services for Sydney Airport, should be considered.

Eligibility for both the Sydney Airport Noise Amelioration Program and the Adelaide Airport Noise Insulation Program is based on aircraft noise exposure calculated under the Australian Noise Exposure Forecast (ANEF) system. These programs involve the insulation of existing residences within the 30 Australian Noise Exposure Index (ANEI) contour and insulation of certain existing public buildings (schools, preschools, hospitals, nursing homes and churches) within the 25 ANEI contour. In the case of Sydney the program also involved voluntary acquisition of existing residential properties and a church within the 40 ANEI contour. Since there are no properties subject to similar levels of aircraft noise exposure in areas surrounding Brisbane Airport, the Government does not intend to extend the program at this stage.

May 2002
Department of Transport and Regional Services