



# **SYDNEY AIRPORT COMMUNITY FORUM**

43<sup>rd</sup> Meeting

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

Friday, 2 September 2005

## **SUMMARY RECORD**

## **AGENDA ITEM 1: Opening Remarks and Adoption of Agenda**

### ***1.1 Opening Remarks***

The Chair opened the meeting at 9.00am welcoming members and proxies representing members to the meeting. Chair noted the apologies from members who were unable to attend.

Attachment A is a list of members and observers attending the meeting.

### ***1.1 Adoption of Agenda***

The Agenda was adopted without amendment.

## **AGENDA ITEM 2: Confirmation of Draft Summary Record (DSR)**

### ***2.1 Draft Summary Record – 42<sup>nd</sup> meeting, 10 June 2005***

The Draft Summary Record (DSR) was presented as the Department's official record. Amendments to the Department's DSR would be noted in the minutes from the 2 September meeting.

SACL made an observation that the bolded text below from Agenda Item 4.4: Airspace Protection in the DSR was not necessarily the case from discussions that they have had with other airports concerning airspace protection:

*At this stage, the Department expected that any amendments should apply to all 22 leased Federal airports. However, if it emerges in the course of the mandatory consultation required by the Office of Regulatory Review that the other 21 airports are satisfied with the regime as it stands (**and they have always indicated this**), then the Department may need to seek legal advice on setting up a separate regime for KSA.*

BARA concurred with SACL's view on this matter.

The meeting noted their concern.

### ***2.2 Draft Summary Record – Community Advocate Sub committee 9 May 2005***

Sub committee members confirmed the record of the teleconference with amendments as presented by Mr Bob Hayes (representing the Hon Joe Hockey MP, Member for North Sydney).

The following text is the amendment to the record of the teleconference:

*"Mr Bob Hayes, (representing the Hon Joe Hockey MP) said that David Southgate appears to have fulfilled the Community Advocate role well. An example the night prior to this teleconference was his attendance at a community meeting arranged by Cr Sue Hoopmann in Hunters Hill on Wednesday 10 August 2005. Public attendance at the meeting was poor due to limited advertising, but David provided straight and*



*precise information to the community members present. However, Mr Hayes believes there is a fundamental conflict of interest problem with the current arrangements. Having a dual role as a DOTARS employee inhibits the Advocate's true independence and, understandably, the incumbent's first priorities will be with the Department as their employer. On the other hand, the Community wants a representative who will be very proactive in looking for improvements and one who will not necessarily accept the status quo.*

*When dealing with the Department and other agencies, the community advocate's role is, on the one hand, to build rapport and establish networks to obtain information and work cooperatively on issues. But on the other hand, when necessary, the Advocate must confront the organisations on behalf of the community. The current conflict of interest arising from the community advocate being located in the Department has the potential consequence of limiting the effectiveness of the role in pursuing the community's interests".*

### **AGENDA ITEM 3: Matters Arising and/or Outstanding from Previous Meeting**

#### **3.1 Correspondence**

The correspondence from the Chair was noted. It was noted that the Minister's reply had not been received but would be soon.

#### **3.2 Action items from the 42<sup>nd</sup> meeting on 10 June 2005**

Members noted where the actions would be discussed from the last meeting.

### **AGENDA ITEM 4: Sydney Airport Corporation Ltd Issues**

SACL indicated that there were no significant developments and activities to report on.

John Clarke (community member Upper North Shore) enquired about any plans by SACL or the Department for the construction of a second Sydney Airport and its intended operational status. It was noted that SACL have first options to construct an airport.

The Second Sydney Airport is to be listed as an agenda item for the November meeting.

*Agenda Item 4.0, Action Item 43/01: DOTARS to brief SACF on the status of a second airport for Sydney.*



## **4.1 Master Plan**

### **4.1.1 A380 Operations**

SACL reported that there was no verifiable noise data available at this time. Works are continuing on upgrading the airport and terminal. SACL indicated they will update SACF on noise data when it becomes available.

SACF is to receive updates not only on noise data but also on the other ongoing operational developments and constraints associated with A380 operations.

The Chair suggested that this item be removed as a specific agenda item on the understanding that SACL would present any noise information to SACF at the first available regular meeting.

## **4.2 Airspace Protection**

The Department provided the following information on its scoping study on high rise developments around Sydney Airport.

- *As indicated at the last meeting, the Department has started a scoping study on high-rise developments around Sydney Airport in order to assess the situation as accurately as possible and to develop any solutions that may be required, such as amendments to the regulatory regime.*
- *To date, we have had productive meetings with the NSW planning authorities in close proximity to the airport such as the Redfern Waterloo Authority, Sydney City Council, and Marrickville Council and others. We have yet to meet with the proposed new planning authority that is to redevelop large areas along Parramatta Road. Its implementation has been delayed by recent changes in the NSW Ministry.*
- *Although most councils consulted already have planning policies that restrict buildings to heights well under the 51M height limit of the Obstacle Limitation Surface (OLS) at Sydney, our study so far has identified a problem in the lack of early notification of a development to the airport operator by the council or the developer. If an airport is not in constant consultation with its local councils over future development that may infringe its airspace, developments can proceed without the knowledge of the airport to such a stage over months or years that there is then little opportunity for SACL or the Department to intervene in a timely manner in the early stages of planning the development to negotiate a reduction in height, if possible.*
- *Consequently, the most useful outcome to date of the study was our productive discussions with the Department of Infrastructure, Planning and Natural Resources (DIPNR) that has overall planning powers for the whole State. As some of you may be aware, NSW is in the process of initiating a state-wide series of planning reforms, including revising the planning approval provisions in the Local Environment Plans (LEPs) councils are required to produce. Depending on further negotiations, DIPNR has offered to include in the LEPs mandatory notification of the Commonwealth's height restrictions in those LGAs which fall under the Commonwealth's airspace protection jurisdiction – some 25 councils in the Sydney metropolitan area.*
- *In practice, on our understanding, this will mean that council officers will be obliged to notify the developer of the Commonwealth height restrictions on the very first enquiry for a development approval in their LGA, and follow that up with notifying the airport and/or the Department of the*



*impending development application. As we understand it, this new requirement will be similar to the noise contour and insulation requirements already part of the LEPs.*

- *This initiative still needs to be refined through further negotiation and will in any case take some time for NSW to implement completely.*
- *In the interim, to cover off the near future, we will be continuing our discussions with councils further out around the airport and having further discussions with Sydney City about high-rise development along South Dowling Street.*
- *In addition, the RWA has offered to map the Commonwealth height restrictions onto its development plans that are just in the process of being produced. It appears to have no difficulties at this stage with the restrictions.*

From the discussion, comments were expressed that the regime starts from the wrong premise. The premise should be that the OLS needs complete protection from future developments and that all building heights should be under the OLS. More information is needed from Corporations about future developmental plans that may pose problems for the OLS. Comments were expressed that proposed legislative changes to planning laws should be a major concern for the airport and its future operations.

The Chair indicated that the Department's work is very important. SACF's concerns should be noted about the long term issues for the airport given the difficult environment it operates under. NSW Planning laws are complex adding to the difficulty.

The Chair suggested that SACF write separately to the Minister indicating

- SACF's appreciation to the Department for the work being undertaken;
- expressing concerns about the long term impact for the airport's operations;
- that the premise should be that all constructions should not penetrate the OLS whatsoever.

The Chair indicated that contributions from John Clarke (community member Upper North Shore) and Robert Balzola (representing John Murphy MP, Federal Member for Lowe) would be sought for the letter.

***Agenda Item 4.2, Action Item 43/02:** SACF to write separately to the Minister concerning airspace protection with contributions from John Clarke (community member Upper North Shore) and Robert Balzola (representing John Murphy MP, Federal Member for Lowe).*

## **AGENDA ITEM 5: LTOP IMC, Review of LTOP and other Airservices Issues**

### **5.1 Implementation and Monitoring Committee**

The community members on the IMC provided a report back on issues discussed at the last IMC meeting.

Noise monitoring has occurred at various locations around Sydney. Reports were contained in the papers for the meeting. Noise monitor has been moved from Botany and future sites to be determined in the northern suburbs.

Airservices advised a consultant had undertaken hand held monitoring at a number of locations. They had received positive community feedback on the provision of this service. Currently the service is on hold as the normal consultant is on leave. The position requires personnel with appropriate qualifications and training to undertake noise monitoring.

The issue of aircraft flight paths over Berowra has been referred to Task Force 3.

There was general discussion on the issue of Chapter 3 aircraft which are significantly louder than permitted levels. CASA provide the approvals for this type of aircraft to fly in and out of Sydney.

It was noted that airports will be given the opportunity to restrict these type of aircraft operations. However, the Department should make decisions regarding aircraft operating into an airport not the airport operator.

European and USA aviation authorities differ in their approach to future operations of these aircraft.

It was again noted that the Department had produced a Discussion paper *Restricting Operations by Marginally Compliant Chapter 3 Aircraft A Proposed Airport – by – Airport Approach* [SACF 2005/012] on this matter which had been issued to members in February 2005. Comments expressed from the community at the meeting in relation to this paper were that it relies on individual airports restricting chapter 3 aircraft operations at their airports. Concern was expressed that the situation with these aircraft may get worse over time not better.

It was noted that phasing out these aircraft would be difficult and that some airline companies use Chapter 3 aircraft to provide budget services.

***Agenda Item 4.2, Action Item 43/03: SACF will seek formal advice from the Department about the phase out of Chapter 3 aircraft.***

Task Force 3 (TF3) had made good progress at this stage. Costings are being finalised with some potential savings. At the next TF3 meeting, it is expected that the community will be in a position to sign off on this matter. Comments expressed from the community were that flight paths are being pushed wider. This matter will be brought to the full SACF for endorsement at a future meeting.

#### 5.1.1 Items referred to SACF

No specific items referred to SACF.

#### 5.1.2 Items referred from SACF

This matter “*the extent to which pilots “call for” the long runway during noise sharing periods*” referred to IMC to discuss.

IMC to give consideration for resolution for handling of noise complaints lodged with the Noise Enquiry Unit.



### 5.1.3 Departures from Runway 34L

#### *The extent to which pilots “call for” the long runway during noise sharing periods*

Bob Hayes (representing the Hon Joe Hockey, Member for North Sydney) discussed this issue.

Explanations were being sought on what procedures exist to minimise this practice. Another issue raised was the multiple plane landings at 6am each day. A possible explanation put forward was that the planes land at this time after being held in a holding pattern prior to the end of curfew.

Murray Warfield (representing Airline Industry) explained Qantas’ position regarding the use of the long runway. Pilots are not likely to submit an arbitrary request just to use this runway.

This matter is referred to IMC for further discussion and resolution.

### 5.2 *Review of the Long Term Operating Plan*

This matter is still to be finalised by the Sub committee. Members were reminded that the record of the teleconference for the LTOP Review Sub committee had been circulated on 24 June 2005. Members were advised that the Schedule of Further work had not been circulated as this matter has not been finalised by the Subcommittee.

The Consultants had provided comments and a programme to undertake the work which has to be agreed upon in aggregate by the Sub committee. This programme was currently with the SC members for their consideration and final decision.

The Consultants will provide definitive costs for the final works once agreed upon.

The Chair suggested that the Subcommittee meet again by Teleconference as soon as possible after the meeting.

It was noted that this further work may carry substantial costs.

*Agenda Item 5.2, Action Item 43/04: LTOP Review Sub committee to meet via teleconference as soon as practicable to discuss the consultant’s programme and comments for the further work.*

### 5.3 *New Technologies Working Group*

In response to Action Item 42/04, Airservices showed a Honeywell video on new technologies. They expressed optimism that this new technology based on satellite systems will be introduced. Airservices thanked Honeywell for allowing this video to be shown.

The Terms of Reference for Taskforce 3 require the committee to look at new technology.

Australia is leading the world in the introduction of this new technology. Regulatory approval for such technology is being sought.

This satellite technology has positive benefits for aircraft operators for safe and stable approaches, a requirement under ICAO standards. Trials of this technology are expected to be underway soon. This technology should overcome many constraints.

## **AGENDA ITEM 6: Noise Insulation**

### **6.1 Noise Amelioration Programme**

#### 6.1.1 Progress Report

The Noise Amelioration Report was noted.

### **6.2 Kurnell Noise Issues**

The Community member for Kurnell discussed the ongoing noise issues for Kurnell.

*Agenda Item 6.2, Action Item 43/05: The Community Member for Kurnell and the Member for Cook should seek a meeting with the new Minister to resubmit that Kurnell should be considered a special case to receive noise insulation.*

## **AGENDA ITEM 7: Noise Monitoring**

Members noted the noise monitoring reports. The reports were provided to show members that noise monitoring is being undertaken. The Chair indicated that presenting the reports in the meeting papers was a benefit to members.

John Clarke (community member Upper North Shore) conveyed Dr Gross' appreciation that Airservices had undertaken noise monitoring at her location. However, it was pointed out that the sample size was small and she was going to seek additional data. It was advised that Dr Gross can seek assistance from Airservices Noise Enquiry Unit.

## **AGENDA ITEM 8: Standing Operational Reports**

### **8.1 Standing Reports**

Members noted the standing reports that had been issued.

Kevin Hill (community member for Kurnell) noted that in the Briefing Notes for Sydney Airport for July the percentage of movements was under 50 per cent which was a particularly positive outcome for this period. The reason for this low percentage could be due to cross runways being used more and possible weather conditions at the time. Airservices offered to look at the statistics again.

It was pointed out that the achievability of the targets is dependent on the right weather conditions.

Congratulations were extended to Airservices on the good operations at the airport for this period.

## **8.2 Curfew**

The curfew reports were noted. Kevin Hill (community member for Kurnell) indicated he had received the Department's report detailing curfew acceptance and rejection statistics for 2003 [SACF 2004/012]. Mr Hill discussed the comparison chart. Concerns were expressed that there is an increase in the number of dispensations being granted.

Kevin Hill requested that the comparison chart be updated to include information up to the present time.

*Agenda Item 8.2, Action Item 43/06: DOTARS to update the Report detailing curfew acceptance and rejection statistics to 2005.*

Robert Balzola (representing John Murphy MP, Member for Lowe) noted that there seems to have been an increase in the number of "blanket" dispensations to facilitate maintenance works.

A dispensation was issued from 15 February until 11 June for necessary airport lighting work on the southern end of runway 34L.

SACL indicated that there was no current blanket dispensation in force for maintenance work.

*Agenda Item 8.2, Action Item 43/07: DOTARS to provide information on the blanket dispensations issued.*

## **AGENDA ITEM 9: SACF Correspondence and Community Issues**

### **9. Correspondence**

The Chair indicated that the Minister's reply was with him for signature. Members will receive a copy of the reply by email as soon as possible. Members noted all other correspondence.

### **9.2 Community Issues**

Senator Payne suggested that anyone attending the meeting who may have current or future commercial interests in the community advocate position may wish to consider leaving the room during the discussion. Mr Tony Williams (representing Cr Fiona Sinclair King, Wentworth Community) left the room.

The Chair advised that the Community Advocate Sub committee resolved to move forward with the position and that a final decision is required from members at this meeting on the future of the position.

Members considered the following resolution which was carried

*That SACF resolves to engage, by public tender, a community advocate using the current position description and the advertisement for the position as contained in the agenda papers.*

Contractual and budgetary processes and details will still need to be finalised in consultation with the Department, to ensure the position is administered in accordance with Commonwealth Procurement Guidelines.

SACL commented that the criteria for position of the Community Advocate may be too broad. Aviation is much more than just Air Traffic Control. The document will be slightly amended to reflect this comment.

***Agenda Item 9.2, Action Item 43/08:*** *The criteria in the position description for the Community Advocate will be amended to address SACL's comments.*

The contract period was to be for initial 24 months and to have four 12 month options not five.

It was noted that Dave Southgate tabled apologies for not attending today. In Dave Southgate's absence, the Chair expressed SACF's most sincere appreciation to him for fulfilling the community advocate's role most professionally, constructively and in a friendly manner to all members of SACF.

The Chair further commented that Dave was most helpful and courteous when attending to her requests for information.

Other similar positive comments were put forward on Dave's professional approach when fulfilling this role.

SACF should write to Dave Southgate expressing its sincere thanks for fulfilling the community advocate role.

***Agenda Item 9.2, Action Item 43/09:*** *SACF to write to Dave Southgate thanking him for temporarily fulfilling the role of community advocate.*

John Clarke (community member Upper North Shore) suggested that SACF be directly involved with the Department in the procurement, evaluation of the tender documents and selection process for the community advocate. Members can nominate for this task. John Clarke (representing the Upper North Shore) volunteered to participate in the process as did Bob Hayes (representing the Member for North Sydney, Joe Hockey MP).

It was noted that it was important for SACF to actively contribute to the procurement process for the community advocate position.

***Agenda Item 9.2, Action Item 42/10:*** *The Department with SACF's active involvement to procure, by public tender, the services of the community advocate.*

Members noted the Community Advocate's Activity Report [SACF 2005/068].

### 9.3 *Summary of Community Submissions*

#### Noise Enquiry Unit – changes to recorded messages

Members were advised that at the last IMC meeting they considered proposed options for improving the Noise Enquiry Service.

The current NEU procedures for lodging complaints were conveyed to members:

*Welcome to Sydney Airport Noise Enquiry Service.*

*If you wish to obtain information concerning current runway operations, please Press 1;*

*For the opportunity to direct your comments to the Chairperson and members of the Sydney Airport Community Forum, please Press 2;*

*If you wish to speak with a Customer Service Representative, please Press 3.*

*Alternatively, we can be contacted through the internet at [www.airservicesaustralia.com](http://www.airservicesaustralia.com) forward slash NCM*

*Or by email at*

*Community dot relations at Airservices Australia dot com.*

*Thank you*

*Please note our normal hours of operation are from 6.30am to 5pm Monday to Friday*

Kevin Hill (community member for Kurnell) outlined a proposal for changes to the way calls are handled in telephone noise complaints. Proposed options for handling complaints were

1. Maintain status quo, but include the SACF Secretariat statistics in the NEU reports;
2. Change the order of the options on the NEU line so that the option to speak to the SACF Chairperson or Member is later in the list; or
3. Remove the option to speak to the SACF Chairperson/Member from the telephone list, but make it an option to be advised to callers by the NEU staff.

Mr Hill indicated that the SACF secretariat should not necessarily be directly involved in receiving these complaints.

Airservices Australia's preference is for option 3 if changes occur. Airservices offered to undertake changes.

The Chair acknowledged Airservices generosity in undertaking the work associated with these enhancements to the current service.

Kevin Hill indicated that the current service only provides statistical data and not the actual complaint. Airservices indicated that detailing complaints is a time consuming process and current practice is to code calls against issues. The coding system could be examined for possible improvements.

Comments were expressed during the discussion that maintenance of strong community links is paramount for SACF. SACF needs to be able to interface with the broader community and the 'Have Your Say' line provides this. An important consideration is that the community should never lose opportunities for providing their views. SACF needs to form a view as to whether a separate line is required for the community. The Chair indicated that the wording in the message should determine this.

This matter was referred back to the IMC to discuss the procedural changes. SACF is to be advised on the progress with proposed changes to the handling of noise complaints by the Noise Enquiry Service.

*Agenda Item 9.2, Action Item 42/11: SACF agrees that the IMC can resolve the procedural changes associated with proposed changes to the handling of noise complaints.*

#### Noise Enquiry Unit – Handling Batch Complaints

Kevin Hill (Representing Kurnell Community) talked to this issue. This matter was brought to the full SACF for its view rather than just IMCs.

There are problems associated with multiple complaints or batch complaints. That is, whether to treat batch complaints as one complaint or multiple. Complainants can lodge multiple complaints by email or by phone. Emails are one contentious example.

Airservices indicated that computer generated complaints are treated as one complaint by one complainant. However, emails detailing many cases are treated as multiple complaints.

Community concerns were that when multiple calls are treated as one complaint this in effect downgrades the complaint and the calls lose credence. The maintenance of strong community links is important to ensure they have a voice and are not sidelined.

Suggested comments were that a separate category for these complaints may capture them more accurately. Different methods may be available for documenting these calls which may provide solutions to the problem.

Comments expressed were that the people in the community are angry and that they do not consider there is much point in lodging complaints. The community submissions recorded by the Department provide more detail about the complaint than NEU statistics. Any statistics should always be a reliable indicator of any problems that exist.

The Chair pointed out to the community members that there was no suggestion whatsoever that residents in their respective communities would be denied opportunities to lodge complaints.

Airservices indicated their willingness to consider a separate category but an overriding issue is to counter any measures by the public to circumvent the system when lodging multiple calls. SACL agreed with this view in that manipulation of the statistics may make them meaningless. The aim in maintaining statistical records is to determine how many people are affected by aircraft noise.

It was noted that computer programmes generating multiple calls cause problems. Calls of this nature can be generated even when a complainant is not present in the house.

The Chair indicated that SACF was in general agreement concerning the handling of these calls and that SACF should consider it again only if any major disagreements develop on handling procedures.

NEU is in the best position to capture these calls properly using appropriate system and identification coding. The current approach should be maintained unless disputes arise between various parties on issues such as figures and or content details.

Airservices suggested that IMC give further consideration to this matter for possible resolution.

*Reinstatement of a free 1800 Number for aircraft noise complaints.*

Bob Hayes (representing the Hon Joe Hockey MP, member for North Sydney) spoke to this issue, emphasizing that it was worthwhile having a free call number.

Comments expressed were that people are not complaining because of the cost of the call. The drop off in complaints with the 1300 number is quite significant.

Community members indicated a preference for an 1800 number for lodging complaints. However, comments expressed were that people are not using the loss of an 1800 number as the reason why they are not lodging complaints. An issue for consideration with supplying an 1800 number service is deterring the generation of mass complaints.

The Airservices Australia Board would require a particularly good explanation for a reversal of its original management decision to change to the 1300 number.

Airservices advised that the introduction of the 1300 number drastically reduced the number of frivolous and nuisance calls and it also deters people from using automated systems. An automated system can create major problems as a new call can be generated every 30 seconds, effectively blocking genuine callers from lodging complaints.

A lower cost option for lodging complaints is the use of the Internet. Airservices could investigate the use of technology to improve the current system. Councils are encouraged to install links on their websites to Airservices' Noise Complaint Service. Promotion of the Internet for lodging noise complaints is to be placed on the agenda for the November meeting.

The Chair indicated that the internet option had been discussed at SACF meetings some years ago and that Airservices were asked to promote this service.



John Clarke (community member Upper North Shore) requested a report on the differences between the number of calls lodged using an 1800 number compared with the number of calls lodged under 1300 number.

*Agenda Item 9.2, Action Item 42/12: Airservices to provide a statistical report on the differences between the number of complaints lodged under the 1800 number and 1300 number.*

*Agenda Item 9.2, Action Item 42/13: Airservices to promote the internet as a viable and alternative method of lodging noise complaints.*

Members noted the submissions from the community.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 10: Other Business**

Members raised no other business

#### **AGENDA ITEM 11: Date of Next Meeting**

Members noted the date of the next meeting.

Actions from the 43<sup>rd</sup> meeting held on 2 September 2005

**Agenda Item 4.0, Action Item 43/01:** DOTARS to brief SACF on the status of a second airport for Sydney.

**Agenda Item 4.2, Action Item 43/02:** SACF to write separately to the Minister concerning airspace protection with contributions from John Clarke (community member Upper North Shore) and Robert Balzola (representing John Murphy MP, Federal Member for Lowe).

**Agenda Item 4.2, Action Item 43/03:** SACF will seek formal advice from the Department about the phase out of Chapter 3 aircraft.

**Agenda Item 5.2, Action Item 43/04:** LTOP Review Sub committee to meet via teleconference as soon as practicable to discuss the consultant's programme and comments for the further work.

**Agenda Item 6.2, Action Item 43/05:** The Community Member for Kurnell and the Member for Cook should seek a meeting with the new Minister to resubmit that Kurnell should be considered a special case to receive noise insulation.

**Agenda Item 8.2, Action Item 43/06:** DOTARS to update the Report detailing curfew acceptance and rejection statistics to 2005.

**Agenda Item 8.2, Action Item 43/07:** DOTARS to provide information on the blanket dispensations issued.

**Agenda Item 9.2, Action Item 43/08:** The criteria in the position description for the Community Advocate will be amended to address SACF's comments.

**Agenda Item 9.2, Action Item 43/09:** SACF to write to Dave Southgate thanking him for temporarily fulfilling the role of community advocate.

**Agenda Item 9.2, Action Item 43/10:** The Department with SACF's active involvement to procure, by public tender, the services of the community advocate.

**Agenda Item 9.2, Action Item 43/11:** SACF agrees that the IMC can resolve the procedural changes associated with proposed changes to the handling of noise complaints.

**Agenda Item 9.2, Action Item 43/12:** Airservices to provide a statistical report on the differences between the number of complaints lodged under the 1800 number and 1300 number.

**Agenda Item 9.2, Action Item 43/13:** Airservices to promote the internet as a viable and alternative method of lodging noise complaints.



ATTACHMENT A:

*Attendance*

**Members**

M	Payne	Senator for NSW, Chair
R	Balzola	Proxy for Mr J Murphy MP, Federal Member for Lowe
W	Bennett	BARA
J	Clarke	Representing Upper North Shore Community
S	Frame	Proxy for Anthony Roberts, Member for Lane Cove
R	Gilmour	Sydney Airport Corporations Ltd
J	Hatten	Proxy for the Hon Bruce Baird, Member for Cook
B	Hayes	Proxy for the Hon Joe Hockey MP, Member for North Sydney
K	Hill	Kurnell Community
S	Kursar	Proxy for Cr Sue Hoopmann, Bennelong Community
A	Sarno	Proxy for Cr John Flowers, Rockdale Council
W	Rylands	Proxy for Cr Ian Longbottom, Lane Cove Council
M	Warfield	Airline Representative
T	Williams	Representing Cr Fiona Sinclair King, Wentworth Community

**Advisers/Secretariat**

N	Williams	Dept of Transport and Regional Services
D	Savage	Dept of Transport and Regional Services
G	Kelly	Dept of Transport and Regional Services

M Gijselman            Office of Senator Marise Payne

T	Grant	Airservices Australia
D	Spinks	Airservices Australia
P	Carroll	Airservices Australia

R	Bartsch	CASA
K	Allcott	Sydney Airport Corporation Ltd
A	Sellick	Airline Industry

**Observers**

R	Anderson	Virgin Blue Airlines
J	Jones	Office of Clover Moore MP
D	Wall	Arncliffe