

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Sydney Airport Community Forum (SACF) Terms of Reference

The role of SACF is to act as a forum for providing advice:

- to the Minister, airport operator and aviation authorities on the abatement of aircraft noise and related environmental issues at Sydney Airport;
- to aviation authorities to facilitate improved consultation and information flows.

Second Sydney Airport (SSA)

A second major international airport serving the Sydney region is the only means by which the future aviation needs of Sydney can be satisfactorily met. Continued growth of the existing airport (KSA) will not cease until the SSA becomes fully operational. Only then will it become possible to reduce aviation activity at KSA to an environmentally acceptable and sustainable level. Necessary decisions now need to be made by the Government. These decisions should be reported in the White Paper which should also include both a commitment and detailed process for site identification, acquisition and protection.

Sydney Kingsford-Smith Airport (KSA)

The need for a second airport derives from KSA approaching if not already exceeding its environmental and operational capacity, in some areas. Much remains to be done to abate existing aircraft noise and related environmental impacts. As new technology becomes available, much more will become possible. SACF expects the Government to provide and support all feasible mechanisms for the abatement of the detrimental impacts of the airport and its operations which current technology will allow and which future developments may make possible. Benefits to communities surrounding major airports often come at some cost or inconvenience to airport operators, airlines or the travelling public. The balanced approach which is necessary to constrain inappropriate industry practices requires the community interest to be recognised, appropriately resourced and taken into account by Government.

Aircraft Noise (and other impacts)

Although emissions are of increasing concern, aircraft noise is still the most significant cause of adverse community reaction to the operation and expansion of airports. Efforts must continue to prevent, minimise and then most equitably distribute the impacts of aircraft noise which cannot be avoided. To date, only the most severely affected properties have been acquired or insulated. Less affected properties should now be offered insulation to the Australian Standard and compensation should be provided to communities where insulation can not be justified. Work should continue on the improvement of existing noise forecasting and measurement procedures together with additional and alternative approaches which may be more effective.

Consultation

The White Paper should clearly state the support of the Government for SACF to continue with its current role and operating arrangements. This should include the support provided by community advocacy services on a continual basis and access to other expert consultant advice as necessary. Surrounding communities should be confident of protection from unconstrained airport expansion. For this to occur, planning, approval procedures and monitoring must be improved and environmental responsibilities must be honoured.

Funding

Existing legislative provisions for aircraft noise insulation and compensation should be amended to the extent necessary so that all costs incurred by the Government in supporting the Sydney Airport Community Forum may also be recoverable from the levy on aircraft operations.

46 1. SECOND SYDNEY AIRPORT (SSA)

47 A second major international airport for Sydney is the only means by which the continued growth of
48 the existing Sydney Kingsford-Smith Airport (KSA) can be brought to a halt. This would also allow
49 residents to hope that the level of aviation activity which is ultimately reached at KSA will eventually
50 be reduced to a lower level that is environmentally sustainable and more acceptable to surrounding
51 communities.

52 SACF notes the statement in the Green Paper that the construction of an airport at Badgerys Creek is
53 no longer an option.

54 1.1 Green Paper

55 The commitment made in the Green Paper is: *“to begin [or initiate] a process to identify additional*
56 *capacity for the Sydney region”*. This is stated to be consistent with Government policy of support for a
57 second airport for Sydney, but is only to commence following the completion of the Sydney Airport
58 Master Plan in 2009. A new master plan may now become necessary following the release of the
59 White Paper. The White Paper ought to provide much more detail concerning the location, role and
60 timing for development of the second airport and should commit to commencement of the
61 identification, acquisition and protection of an appropriate site.

62 1.2 Sydney Region’s Long-term Aviation Needs

63 If the processes required to identify additional capacity for the Sydney region are described
64 comprehensively in the White Paper then the many problems which have been associated with all
65 previous second Sydney airport site selection processes might be avoided or reduced.

66 SACF supports *the “principles for provision of government services at new international airports”*.
67 These principles are relevant to the establishment of the second airport as a major international
68 airport. In addition, fundamental decisions, which should have already been made, and should now be
69 made without further delay, are:

- 70 – whether it is intended that the SSA should be the primary airport for Sydney or not;
- 71 – the SSA role as a major international airport with the capability of being developed into a
72 replacement airport so that this option remains open to any future Government;
- 73 – the initial level of development which is proposed;
- 74 – development stages and timings or triggers (if staged development is intended);
- 75 – whether traffic will initially be transferred from KSA to the SSA to assist in it becoming viable and
76 if so the basis upon which the nature and extent of this transfer will be determined;
- 77 – an estimated time to become operational initially and for subsequent stages, if applicable;
- 78 – the process by which a site will be identified, selected and protected including a thorough
79 environmental assessment process;
- 80 – arrangements for the provision of adequate road and rail links to Sydney.

81 1.3 Location Constraints

82 With respect to potential sites, the White Paper should document any principles which might apply or
83 decisions which may already have been made with respect to geographical areas or existing airports.
84 If this information is not included, then it should be made available separately.

85 1.4 Protecting the Airport Site

86 The lessons to be learned from the Badgerys Creek experience are:

- 87 – criteria for determination of the area to be protected must be soundly based with the support of
88 the state government and all affected local councils;
89 – allowance should be made for all potential future growth;
90 – limits to the powers of state and local governments need to be fully understood;
91 – where the rights (and reasonable expectations) of property owners or local councils are to be
92 denied, then compensation must be paid as part of the cost of development.

93 Ever since the 1985 House of Representative Select Committee on Aircraft Noise Report, the
94 approach of the Commonwealth has been to expect that any further residential or other development
95 which might be incompatible with the continued existence or growth of a major airport such a Sydney
96 would be controlled by local councils with the support of their state governments. Where this has
97 required the rights or reasonable expectations of property owners to be denied, no provision has ever
98 been made for compensation. This accounts for most of the incompatible development which has
99 been allowed in the past and which may be supported in the future, by local governments.

100 2. SYDNEY KINGSFORD-SMITH AIRPORT (KSA)

101 2.1 Public Submissions Supported

102 Submissions made members of the public supported, amongst other things:

- 103 – improvements in the planning and development regime under the *Airports Act 1996*;
104 – plans to be subject to review by an independent panel;
105 – non-aeronautical developments on airports subject to local planning laws;
106 – payment of developer contributions for infrastructure support costs;
107 – the capacity of Sydney Airport to be resolved by identifying and securing a site for a second
108 airport;
109 – curfews and movement caps at Sydney to be retained & protected;
110 – access to Sydney by rural and regional passengers to be retained.

111 2.2 Safety

112 The principal safety issues of concern to SACF are:

- 113 – the safety of residents beneath flight paths from: plane crashes; falling parts; and wake
114 turbulence;
115 – ageing aircraft and airport infrastructure;
116 – resistance to retrofitting of existing aircraft with new technology such as ADS-B causing further
117 delay to the implementation of LTOP flight paths;
118 – lack of transparency, accountability and access to information;
119 – the adequacy of co-operation between Government Departments and Agencies.

120 2.3 Curfew and Cap

121 SACF notes that the legislated curfew and movement cap will remain in place at the existing Sydney
122 Airport.

123 It is of the utmost importance that the current curfew at Sydney Airport be maintained, not just in
124 principle but also in practice. This should include all associated monitoring, reporting and penalty
125 provisions. Dispensations should only be granted in exceptional circumstances.

126 In view of the submission on the Green Paper made by Sydney Airport Corporation Ltd, the White
127 Paper should specifically state that the Government is committed to maintaining the numbers of

128 aircraft operations currently prescribed by the Sydney Airport Curfew Regulations 1995 and not the
129 larger limitations which the Act imposes on the numbers which may be prescribed by the Regulations.

130 2.4 Master Plan

131 A new master plan may be required to identify the capacity required to satisfy interim demand based
132 on the environmentally acceptable level to which the existing airport will need to be returned once the
133 Second Airport is operational. The White Paper should establish the respective future roles of a
134 Second Sydney Airport and KSA. Future versions of the Sydney Airport Master Plan should be based
135 on this foundation. With respect to International Aviation, SACF is concerned by the absence of any
136 mention in the Green Paper or in the recent Preliminary Draft Master Plan, of arrivals at Sydney
137 during the curfew shoulder period 5-6 am, and by what may be inferred from the Sydney Airport
138 Corporation submission, that demand may soon exceed the current quota.

139 2.5 Consumer Protection and Competition

140 Development within the boundaries of the airport should not be exempted from a requirement to make
141 payments equivalent to local rates. SACF supports the liability and insurance review and all inclusive
142 pricing. The principal issues of concern to SACF with respect to consumer protection are:

- 143 – the *Damage by Aircraft Act 1999* and the need for insurance coverage which is both adequate
144 and compulsory;
- 145 – Competition and the need for competitive neutrality without exemptions;
- 146 – Consumer standards and expectations - specifically current inadequate provision for car access
147 by "meeters and greeters";
- 148 – Damage caused by aircraft to parties on the ground and the need for adequate coverage together
149 with readily accessible information, accommodating claim procedures, and the need to resolve
150 any relationship issues between state and Commonwealth legislation.

151 2.6 Quality of Service and Passenger Access

152 SACF supports quality of service monitoring and the development of a consultation paper on
153 proposed changes. The Forum has had concerns expressed to it with respect to both the cost of
154 parking and the inadequacy of options available to "meeters and greeters". Additional reporting and
155 monitoring is supported together with more transparent and accountable planning.

156 3. AIRCRAFT NOISE - and other impacts

157 SACF accepts and agrees that aircraft noise is the most significant cause of adverse community
158 reaction to the operation and expansion of airports. The Forum is also aware of the increasing
159 significance of aircraft emissions, particularly in the context of climate change. The potential health
160 effects of both noise and emissions are not mentioned in the Green Paper. The White Paper should
161 commit the Government to a continuous review of all related international research. The Government
162 should also support continuing efforts by representative community forums and consultative
163 committees to prevent, minimise, equitably distribute, abate and, as a last resort, to compensate for
164 the detrimental effects of airports and aircraft operations.

165 3.1 Prevention, Minimisation and Equitable Distribution

166 The White Paper should include environmental capacity, sustainability and aircraft noise minimisation
167 as fundamental objectives of a balanced Aviation Policy. The policy should specifically state that
168 aircraft noise minimisation is to be preferably achieved by avoiding residential overflights through the
169 use of flight paths over water and non-residential areas. Where residential overflights are
170 unavoidable, the burden of aircraft noise should be borne fairly across the broad community.

171 In the design or management of airspace and of aircraft operations, opportunities exist for both the
172 minimisation and more equitable distribution of aircraft noise. These opportunities are more likely to
173 be realised if environmental awareness and obligations are made a component of Air Traffic Control
174 education. With respect to Industry Skills and Productivity, the process whereby this might most
175 appropriately and effectively be achieved should be given consideration.

176 The aviation industry is to be commended for the introduction of newer quieter aircraft such as the
177 A380. However past experience has shown that newer quiet aircraft are often larger and noisier than
178 the aircraft which they replace. Ever increasing numbers of aircraft operations have, in the past, offset
179 any overall community benefit which would otherwise have been realised. There is no reason to
180 believe this will not continue at Sydney until such time as all future growth is accommodated by a
181 Second Sydney Major International Airport.

182 3.2 Aviation Emissions and Climate Change

183 SACF acknowledges climate change as a significant issue for the future and notes that noise
184 reduction and reduced emissions are likely to become competing objectives for the aviation industry.
185 The Forum agrees with and supports the broader Government policy on climate change and has no
186 objection to any of the measures which are proposed.

187 There will be instances such as the implementation of LTOP flight paths, where SACF will prefer to
188 see a "carbon offset" approach rather than the minimisation of track miles. Any reference to offsets
189 should include the need to regulate the offset industry with emission reduction guarantees. The
190 community would not accept minimising flight tracks as an excuse for increasing community noise
191 exposure or flight concentrations.

192 3.3 Aircraft Noise Management

193 SACF submits that careful consideration at all airports will need to be given to performance based
194 navigation (PBN) including the following measures in order that aircraft noise is not increased and so
195 that opportunities for a reduction are not lost:

- 196 – flexible flight tracks;
- 197 – improving aircraft traffic control sequencing;
- 198 – continuous descent approaches.

199 It is understood that the intended function of the Airservices Noise Enquiry Unit (NEU) is to provide
200 information and not to initiate change. This accounts for the reluctance of some residents to ever
201 complain and why others who do are often dissatisfied. It also explains why a mechanism which can
202 initiate changes is necessary in addition to the NEU and WebTrak. The reason why many complaints
203 come from outside areas which the Department and Airservices conventionally describe as noise-
204 affected is fully explained by the concept of a "dose-response" relationship which is described in the
205 *National Acoustic Laboratories Report, Aircraft Noise in Australia: A survey of community reaction*
206 *1982*.

207 Members acknowledge and support the Government's commitment to:

- 208 – improving the dialogue;
- 209 – looking for a more even-handed method for distributing the responsibility for management;
- 210 – working with communities to improve the quality of, and access to, transparent aircraft noise
211 information.

212 However the Forum questions the extent to which the acknowledged incompatibility between Sydney
213 Airport and the surrounding community should require adjustment by the community rather than
214 restraint by the airport. One criticism of the Green Paper is the extent to which it concentrates on

215 solutions for new “green field” airport sites. Mention is made of only one such airport i.e. the SSA.
216 Policies which might protect communities from the impacts of all 21 existing federal leased airports,
217 including Sydney, are given inadequate attention. Responsibility for aircraft noise minimisation is not
218 clearly accepted by the Government, neither is it allocated to airport operators or the aviation industry.

219 The Green Paper appears to concentrate on measures which are appropriate to the establishment of
220 a new airport:

- 221 – where communities already exist, they should not be deprived of essential services such as
222 schools and hospitals;
- 223 – it is important that an inclusive approach be taken to Councils and any revenue denied through
224 planning requirements;
- 225 – further land acquisition adjacent to Sydney Airport is undesirable;
- 226 – care must be taken to ensure that new technology such as ADS-B and procedures such as
227 constant descent arrivals do not lead to a concentration of aircraft flight paths or cause any
228 further delay in the implementation of LTOP flight paths at Sydney.

229 3.4 Noise Insulation

230 The original aircraft noise insulation program at Sydney was to last 10 years and be based on the
231 Australian Noise Exposure Forecast (ANEF). This was subsequently reduced to 2 years and the basis
232 was changed to the previous year’s exposure or Index (ANEI).

- 233 – the insulation program at Sydney has done much to alleviate the worst of the problems caused by
234 excessive aircraft noise exposure but it has not done anywhere near as much as should have
235 been done or might now be done;
- 236 – communities who remain exposed to levels which are defined as excessive or unacceptable by
237 the Australian Standard but were never offered insulation would appreciate a process by which
238 their current circumstances could be reviewed;
- 239 – consideration should be given to a measure of exposure during the curfew period such as an N65
240 which might provide a reasonable basis for providing some level of insulation to the very small
241 number of residents affected in this way;
- 242 – provision was not previously made for maintenance and replacement costs. This should be a
243 component of any future program;

244 As a consequence:

- 245 – the cost of insulation has been transferred from the polluter to property owners and developers;
- 246 – the vast majority of properties exposed to excessive (incompatible) levels of aircraft noise are not
247 adequately insulated.

248 Future insulation should be funded and administered by Government with the cost being recovered by
249 a charge on aircraft operations. Unless or until Australian Standard AS2021 is materially amended or
250 replaced, the provision of insulation should generally be in accordance with this standard noting the
251 contradiction of the Standard which is drafted as if all sites are Greenfield and ignores the fact that
252 there are existing dwellings in areas where the Standard prohibits the construction of new dwellings.
253 Overseas practice which exceeds the Australian standard should be identified and considered as the
254 basis for amendment.

255 3.5 Noise Forecasting and Measurement

256 The Green paper asserts that ANEF does not meet the needs of airports, planners, developers or the
257 community. It would be helpful if the White paper were to be more specific. Some community
258 concerns which have been expressed are due to way in which ANEF contours are modelled and
259 presented by Airservices Australia and not due to the measure itself. One particular concern i.e. noise

260 exposure outside of the 20 ANEF level was specifically addressed in the report of the *Senate*
261 *Committee on Aircraft Noise in Sydney 1985*. This stated in par 8.110 *It is essential that information*
262 *concerning noise impact at levels below 20 ANEF be provided to affected communities*. This was
263 ignored in the Government Response to this report and by Airservices Australia in both their
264 production of ANEI's and their endorsement of ANEF's subsequently.

265 The Government should commit funding and resources to the updating and improvement of ANEF,
266 the addition of other measures which are complimentary, and the investigation of alternative
267 measures which improve upon ANEF, subject to community acceptance. Confidence in long range
268 forecasts would be considerably improved if the Government were to take action to ensure access by
269 or on behalf of affected communities, to all of the information on which such forecasts are based. In
270 the development of additional and alternative measures, a distinction must continue to be drawn
271 between the needs of individual residents which are better satisfied by location specific measures
272 such as N70 and those of decision-makers who require an overall cumulative measure such as ANEF.

273 3.6 Noise Information – as a management tool

274 SACF agrees that information is an essential first step, however:

- 275 – while the introduction of WebTrak and the Transparent Noise Information Package (TNIP) are
276 highly commended, these are acknowledged to be a source of information and not a mechanism
277 which can readily bring about change. Separate mechanisms need to be provided with the
278 purpose of identifying and implementing changes and these also need to be appropriately
279 funded;
- 280 – the provision of information at a broad "man in the street level" must not become an excuse for
281 withholding specific detailed information which is necessary in order to identify and analyse
282 options which may lead to some improvement;
- 283 – a distinction needs to be drawn between the information needs of the individual and those of
284 decision-makers and analysts, none of which should be satisfied at the expense of any other.

285 3.7 Compensation

286 The Aircraft Noise Levy Collection Act 1995 defines **noise amelioration program**, in relation to an
287 airport as, in part:

288 “a program undertaken or supported by the Commonwealth to compensate persons for the impact of
289 aircraft noise on occupants of public buildings, or residences around the airport”.

290 However, the provision of compensation has never formed part of a noise amelioration program
291 undertaken or supported by the Government.

292 SACF submits that compensation should be provided:

- 293 – to communities which are outside areas which are otherwise considered to be eligible for
294 insulation;
- 295 – in accordance with a mechanism which needs to be developed, in consultation with affected
296 communities, which would define criteria for determining the area within which residents might be
297 considered eligible for compensation;
- 298 – in proportion to the number of people which might be expected to be moderately affected.

299 4. CONSULTATION

300 4.1 Sydney Airport Community Forum (SACF)

301 Requirements for participation and consultation with communities surrounding Australia's 5 major
302 capital city airports differ markedly from others of the 21 leased federal airports and these from all
303 smaller regional airports. Due to a combination of the airport size, runway configuration, level of
304 aviation activity, capacity limitations and surrounding residential development, Sydney Airport is
305 significantly and substantially different from the major capital city airports of Melbourne, Brisbane,
306 Perth and Adelaide. Provisions which are made by Government for community consultation need to
307 reflect these differences. SACF understands that the Government is committed to the Sydney Airport
308 Community Forum continuing with its current role and operating arrangements going forward. It is
309 important that this is clearly stated in the White Paper.

310 The White Paper should accept and acknowledge that:

- 311 – SACF has a unique role of providing advice to the Minister;
- 312 – the number, magnitude, importance and complexity of issues which consistently come before the
313 Forum require that it have access to a community advocate on a continuing basis and to
314 additional expert independent consultant advice, as circumstances may require;
- 315 – the funding of community consultation should be a function of Government and not the airport
316 operator. It should be seen as an essential component of expenditure on aviation infrastructure in
317 the Sydney region over future decades and not just an option for favourable economic times.
318 Government costs should be recovered from a levy on aircraft operations.

319 To do otherwise would put Sydney communities affected by the both the existing and proposed
320 second airport at an extreme disadvantage relative to the resources of airport operators and the
321 aviation industry.

322 The establishment of a national Aviation Ombudsman should be explored.

323 4.2 Protection of Airports

324 Different opinions are likely to be held concerning what is "reasonable" provision for the protection and
325 continued development of Sydney Airport. SACF agrees with and is deeply concerned by the fact that
326 Sydney Airport is approaching both environmental and operational capacity. Continued growth at
327 Sydney Airport will result in a reduced level of service for airport users but will also exacerbate the
328 impact on the community, by spreading the peak of operations, limiting options for noise sharing and
329 reducing respite. Continued protection of Sydney Airport and unconstrained development without
330 adequate regard for its impact on surrounding areas is no longer an acceptable option.

331 The Forum is concerned about the excessive use of land on airport sites for developments not directly
332 related to airport operations. An additional concern is the extent to which this and aviation related
333 development is exempt from the costs and regulatory processes which would otherwise apply if the
334 land were not owned by the Commonwealth. It should be a requirement that all airport consultative
335 committees be fully informed of all significant airport developments.

336 SACF supports:

- 337 – improved coordination with state and territory and local governments and better integration of on-
338 airport and off-airport planning which, in the case for Sydney Airport, should be subject to the
339 planning laws of NSW like every other business;
- 340 – a clearer framework for protecting airport operations from inappropriate development around
341 airport sites (but with compensation for lost rights).

342 4.3 Planning

343 The White Paper will need to detail how responsible planning can and will be achieved with a proper
344 balance between aviation and community interests. Any new national land-use planning regime must
345 ensure that local councils have access to all necessary knowledge and expertise so that they can
346 effectively participate in the development of this regime if they are to inherit primary responsibility for
347 implementation.

348 SACF agrees:

- 349 – that the airport master planning process can (and should) be strengthened to provide greater
350 transparency and certainty (however investor certainty and community confidence should be
351 recognised as often being mutually exclusive);
- 352 – current master plan and major development plan arrangements have not adequately addressed
353 community concerns;
- 354 – they should include the coverage of interim periods between 5 year plans;
- 355 – both a ground transport plan and airport environment strategy should be incorporated in all airport
356 master plans;
- 357 – public transport and car parking access for passengers and 'meeters and greeters' are a
358 particular concern;
- 359 – the Minister should have the power to call for, consider, and approve precinct plans for areas
360 which are to be used for non-aeronautical development but also to obtain planning advice from
361 local councils.

362 If this is the intention of the Government that the Department becomes less involved and more
363 reliance is placed on airport operators, then it becomes even more essential that the community and
364 their representatives become effectively empowered and resourced leading to a more equitable
365 outcome and a proper process involving local councils. The establishment of an expert Airport
366 Planning Advisory Panel for Sydney is supported provided that SACF may nominate one expert
367 representative.

368 4.4 Approvals

369 What might be seen by the community as the application of appropriate checks and balances is quite
370 likely to be perceived by the aviation industry as a barrier to investment. LGA's and airport
371 consultative committees should not be excluded from the process of improving oversight of Australia's
372 critical airport infrastructure. However, such involvement is without value if it is not accompanied by
373 access to the information on which proposals are based, sufficient for informed judgements to be
374 made. Where plans which are submitted for approval differ from those which have been placed on
375 public exhibition for comment, these must also be made public at the time they are submitted.

376 SACF agrees that:

- 377 – the Government should review the triggers to ensure they do not allow proposals that may have
378 significant community impacts to proceed without community consideration;
- 379 – consideration should be given to the potential community impacts which an on-airport
380 development may have, including environmental or economic impacts, impacts on access to the
381 airports, traffic congestion, local transport networks, and noise;
- 382 – a Ministerial call-in power should be provided with objective criteria for the use thereof.

383 4.5 Environmental and Other Obligations

384 Obligations under the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* should be
385 fulfilled by airports but also by the Department and by government agencies such as Airservices

386 Australia. This should also apply to all assessments which are undertaken and approvals which are
387 given or which are given by the Minister on advice from his department or an agency. The practice of
388 accreditation of approvals under the *Airports Act 1996* in most instances is undesirable and should
389 become the exception rather than the rule.

390 4.6 Monitoring and Enforcement

391 Rather than the economic issues of prices and services on which the Green Paper concentrates, the
392 primary concerns of SACF are with the monitoring of aircraft noise and related environmental issues
393 at Sydney Airport. The organisations responsible for these are:

- 394 - the airport lessee company and operator – Sydney Airport Corporation Ltd
- 395 - the provider of air traffic services – Airservices Australia
- 396 - the operators of aircraft – Airline Companies

397 For the Forum to have a meaningful role, the Government would need to establish a right of access to
398 information as opposed to this currently being provided at the discretion of the organisation concerned
399 and frequently with conditions of confidentiality and use. It would also be of assistance if a right of
400 appeal could be created in circumstances where “commercial in confidence” is given as an excuse for
401 withholding essential information.

402 Enforcement is in large part dependent upon the provisions of the legislation under which an action is
403 taken or an approval is given. Greater reliance on the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity*
404 *Conservation Act 1999* could assist in this regard. Almost 12 years since the Ministerial Direction to
405 implement the Long Term Operating Plan (LTOP) for Sydney Airport and Associated Airspace was
406 given to Airservices Australia under subsection 16(1) of the *Airservices Act 1996*, a useful first step
407 might be to require an explanation in writing for those elements which have never been implemented.

408 5. FUNDING

409 5.1 Legislation - existing

410 The *Aircraft Noise Levy Collection Act 1995* currently defines a noise amelioration program in sec 3:

411 **noise amelioration program**, in relation to an airport, means a program undertaken or supported by
412 the Commonwealth to do either or both of the following:

- 413 (a) *reduce the impact of aircraft noise on occupants of public buildings, or residences around the*
414 *airport;*
- 415 (b) *compensate persons for the impact of aircraft noise on occupants of public buildings, or*
416 *residences around the airport.*

417 5.2 Legislation – proposed

418 SACF submits that, to the extent that it may be considered necessary to do so, current
419 Commonwealth Legislation and Regulations should be amended so as to make provision for the
420 Commonwealth to recover all costs incurred in the undertaking or support of any of the following
421 activities:

- 422 (a) airport community forums or consultative committees, including the provision of:
 - 423 - chair, secretariat and other administrative services,
 - 424 - community advocacy services,
 - 425 - expert consultant advice;
- 426 (b) insulation to reduce the impact of aircraft noise;
- 427 (c) compensation to communities for the impact of aircraft operations.