



Airport Noise Abatement Consultative Committee (ANACC) Meeting Minutes

Date: Thursday 22nd June 2017
Time: 0900 – 1200hrs (QLD Time)
Location: Twin Towns Resort – Bay Room

Members

Matt Bender (Chairman)	Gold Coast Airport
Jemma Bishop (Secretary)	Gold Coast Airport
Neil Hall	Airservices Australia
Barry Jephcote	SECCA
Bill Pinkstone	Banora Point & District Residents Association
Brad Pearce	Tweed Shire Council
Brett Curtis	Gold Coast Airport
David Gray	Bilinga Neighbourhood Watch
Garth Threlfall	Friends of Currumbin
Glenda Threlfall	<i>Proxy</i> - Tugun Progress Association
Guy Proctor	Jetstar
John Hicks	Gold Coast Lifestyle Association
Lindy Smith	Tweed Heads Residents & Ratepayers Association
Scott Stephens	Airservices Australia
Rob Anderson	Virgin Australia

Observers

Helen Twohill	Fingal Head Community Association
Julie Murray	Kingscliff Rate Payers Association
Val Kirk	Kingscliff

Apologies

Audra Topping	Tugun Progress Association
Donna Kerr	Department of Infrastructure
Graham Quick	Jetstar
Jodie Bellchambers	Office of Justine Elliot
John Alcorn	Airport Central Corridor Alliance
Josh Ireland	Department of Infrastructure
Melissa Pearce	Gold Coast Airport
Peter Long	General Aviation
Tania Macdonald	Department of Infrastructure

1. Opening and Welcome

Matt Bender Chairman opened the meeting at 09.09 and welcomed members and observers to the June ANACC Meeting.

The Chair introduced John Hicks from the Gold Coast Lifestyle Association and welcomed John to the Committee as a new member.

2. Apologies and Proxies

As recorded above.

3. Acceptance of Minutes of Previous ANACC Meeting

The Chair asked the Committee if there were any comments on the previous meeting minutes. John Hicks, Lindy Smith and Helen Twohill made amendments to the minutes.

4. Business Arising from Minutes

ANACC Northern Membership

Northern Subcommittee have met to discuss the applications and nominations received. Gold Coast Airport are currently investigating further into active groups north of the airport that would be appropriate. The Northern Sub Committee have identified a couple other alternatives. Will carry the action over to the next meeting. Awaiting decision from the AAT.

- **ITEM OPEN**

5. Correspondence

In	Category	Out
27/02/17 Jennifer Bolitho (Banora Point) to ANACC	N, C, RPT	28/02/17 MBender to Jennifer Bolitho (Banora Point)
03/03/17 Liz Gi to ANACC	N, H	
10/03/17 Michael Tolerton (Currumbin) to ANACC	N, RPT	MBender phone response
07/04/17 Lynn Griffin (Tugun) to GCAL	N, H	MBender phone response
21/04/17 Kate Whitehouse (Robina) to GCAL	N, C, RPT	24/04/17 MBender to Kate Whitehouse (Robina)

Category Legend			
C	Curfew	H	Helicopter
F	Flight Path	LA	Light Aircraft
G	General	RPT	Regular Public Transport
N	Noise		

6. General Aviation Update

Peter Long was unable to attend the meeting, but provided the following update through the chair.

Due to the inclement weather there have been less training and activity in the General Aviation area. There were only a couple of noise queries from north Ocean Shores which Peter has dealt with directly. Peter has indicated that night flying with increase shortly with the fine winter weather, however they are mindful of the impact to the residents.

Gold Coast Airport has ongoing discussions with the helicopter operations on site, if anyone has any issues or concerns we will talk to the complainant directly.

7. Airservices Report

Neil Hall provided a presentation to the Committee, covering the following:

- Actions from last meeting
- Runway 32 RNP AR Update
- Runway 32 departures speed change
- Online noise report
- Sub Committee questions

A copy of Neil’s presentation is attached to these minutes.

<u>Question/Discussion</u>	<u>Response</u>
Actions from last meeting	
John Hicks – Gold Coast Lifestyle Association <i>Airservices now has a noise portal, and we would be happy to have the link and the factsheet on our website to use as a promotional tool.</i>	Neil Hall – Airservices <i>It’s getting people to know about it and getting people to use the site.</i>
David Gray – Bilinga Neighbourhood Watch <i>It would be good to have a combined links page which contains everything that we would need.</i>	Neil Hall – Airservices <i>I’ll consider the factsheet and let the committee know.</i>
Garth Threlfall - Friends of Currumbin <i>How accurate are the noise monitors on webtrack?</i>	Neil Hall – Airservices <i>The international modelling program that we use is very accurate. We performed a trial in Perth where we installed noise monitors and flew aircraft over those monitors to test the modelling, there were only minor decibel differences. When we were looking into the ILS impacts on the Gold Coast instead of putting a monitor in Palm Beach we looked at other monitors in the country at the same distance using an ILS, we used the data from those to help with the assessment. We have acoustic engineers that are employed full time that are continuously working on the data.</i>
Bill Pinkstone - Banora Point & District Residents Association <i>The issues is that the community can’t see that and they need validation. We have discussed this for years, and it was taken out. The community’s expectation is that it will be reinstated, is it a cost saving method or is it in the too hard basket?</i>	Neil Hall – Airservices <i>We have been through this before, we have looked for locations and couldn’t find anywhere. We then asked for feedback and there was still no suitable locations, so we moved on. The noise monitoring program is an expensive program. The noise monitors we already have provide the data that we require, we don’t think it will provide any additional information.</i>
Bill Pinkstone - Banora Point & District Residents Association	Neil Hall – Airservices <i>The discussions that happened when it was first</i>

Have you approached the Tweed Shire Council as the issues that were there are no longer present?

removed around the number of issues with that site. Noise monitors aren't put in just for the community they are put in for Airservices overall requirements for measuring noise. Airservices will determine how many monitors are needed depending on the airport and the infrastructure. The community can provide some input but we make the decision.

Bill Pinkstone - Banora Point & District Residents Association

We are sick of not being listened to. We want the noise monitor back. I fit is a cost saving exercise or don't feel as if it is necessary, the community feels as if it is necessary. They want to be able to access accurate information online, as it is a useful tool.

Neil Hall – Airservices

The noise information is still accurate online, it is not based on if there is a monitor in that location.

Bill Pinkstone - Banora Point & District Residents Association

It is not accurate as it is done off modelling.

Neil Hall – Airservices

The modelling is accurate.

Bill Pinkstone - Banora Point & District Residents Association

When the information is taken from a different location that has a different terrain it changes the information. We have demanded to have the monitor reinstated but we are getting nowhere.

Lindy Smith - Tweed Heads Residents & Ratepayers Association

You have no data for different atmospheric pressures, temperature and climatic conditions it is inadequate monitoring

Neil Hall – Airservices

Our acoustic engineers are the experts in modelling, the noise modelling is accurate. Noise modelling takes a lot of things into account. It's not just for the community that we use the monitors for, we use them to meet our requirements. One noise monitor north and one south of the runway helps to validate our data.

Bill Pinkstone - Banora Point & District Residents Association

Who do we have to write to in Airservices for someone to get the message that we want to monitor back and we expect it back. Airservices took a critical facility away based on sound reasoning, did nothing for three years, did nothing for four years tried to put it in a caravan park, numerous sites suggest by us have been ignored and now we are told that we can't have it back.

Neil Hall – Airservices

Airservices spent months looking for a suitable location, we asked both the CACG and the ANACC for information. We exhausted every suggestion and proposal that we were given. We had to move on.

Bill Pinkstone - Banora Point & District Residents Association

But you still haven't approached Tweed Shire Council.

Neil Hall – Airservices

I don't know if we have.

Bill Pinkstone - Banora Point & District Residents Association

Can we move a motion for **Airservices Australia** make a request to **Tweed Shire Council (TSC)** regards permission to have an aircraft noise monitor located at the sewage treatment plant.

Lindy Smith - Tweed Heads Residents & Ratepayers Association
I'd like to second that.

Matt Bender – Gold Coast Airport

You are welcome to move a motion, but I don't think the issues is Tweed Shire Council having a say on if they will permit it somewhere. I think there are underlying issues that the location doesn't meet certain requirements.

Bill Pinkstone - Banora Point & District Residents Association

They haven't shown us that it doesn't meet certain requirements.

Lindy Smith - Tweed Heads Residents & Ratepayers Association

It met requirements for a long time before. The issue is that there are proposed developments at the airport and then there is a community that is the most impacted by works has no data to support it.

Matt Bender – Gold Coast Airport

That is all understood, you are welcome to move a motion, but I doubt the council giving permission will be the mitigating fact.

Bill Pinkstone - Banora Point & District Residents Association

It's the first step for it to be re-established where it was before, all the reasons that it was taken out are no longer present.

Garth Threlfall - Friends of Currumbin

I have recently had complaints from Currumbin Hill recently that the planes have been louder lately, what do we say to the community when they want the level of sound from that particular plane at that height?

Neil Hall – Airservices

We use the modelling and other noise monitors around the country to cross reference the data to work out the noise level.

John Hicks – Gold Coast Lifestyle Association

Another factor is the inputs that they use for the modelling, they use model landings and model take offs for the data. This is why we need validation, aircraft don't always fly the precise path and the difference of a few hundred meters makes a big difference on ground. This is one of the issues that I have raised in the works program I suggested, with the airport proposing to go from 40,000 aircraft movements per year to over 100,000 in the next 20 years we need to get our act together with actual noise monitoring. Whether it is expertly designed, permanent installations or periodic noise monitoring to validate the noise models. It's all part of operating a noisy business surrounded by communities. I support the motion

<p>Bill Pinkstone - Banora Point & District Residents Association Can I further move that Airservices report back at the next ANACC with the outcomes from the approaches and any reasons as to why it can't be placed there.</p>	<p>Neil Hall – Airservices The issue I have is that when we come back to the committee with those reasons as to why we can't where do we go from there.</p>
<p>Bill Pinkstone - Banora Point & District Residents Association We have never been provided any reasons as to why it can't be put there and then we can move forward.</p>	<p>Matt Bender – Gold Coast Airport The specific content of the motion is for “Airservices Australia make a request to Tweed Shire Council (TSC) regards permission to have an aircraft noise monitor located at the sewage treatment plant, and for TSC to advise any reasons as to why it can't be located there.”</p>
<p>Bill Pinkstone - Banora Point & District Residents Association We have the dilemma that we have over Banora Point because the noise modelling that we were presented at the time was rubbish. The modelling doesn't work, the community doesn't trust the modelling, and they want it validated.</p>	<p>Neil Hall – Airservices I think there is a misunderstanding as to what the noise monitors are for, they are not specifically for the community.</p>
<p>“Airservices Australia make a request to Tweed Shire Council (TSC) regards permission to have an aircraft noise monitor located at the sewage treatment plant, and for TSC to advise any reasons as to why it can't be located there.” Motion was raised to vote - unanimous support.</p>	

Online Noise Report

<p>Barry Jephcote – SECCA Can the Banora data be split between East and West Banora?</p>	<p>Neil Hall – Airservices Yes I will raise an action to see if it can be done.</p>
---	--

Sub Committee Questions

<p>Lindy Smith - Tweed Heads Residents & Ratepayers Association In both the ANEF and N70 contours it does not reflect the significant change to departures over South Tweed, should there be a review of the contours?</p>	<p>Neil Hall – Airservices Airservices are required to look at the proposed flight paths in the Master Plan and verify that they are correct. In the last Master Plan we predicted a spread not a straight line, it was based on existing data. For the straight ahead approach we know there is a little bit of movement around a couple hundred meters, we always predicted some spread. That would be captured in the ANEF. Can you confirm this is what we do, Brett?</p>
	<p>Brett Curtis – Gold Coast Airport We go through with a consultant who engages with Airservices and draws out all the flight tracks to</p>

	<p>develop an ANEI, which is a 12 month review of what actually happened. That data is then inputted into the model to prepare for the ANEF. Any new proposed flight paths would be laid on top and the assigned usage will be put to each flight path, Airservices then endorse the process that we have undertaken to develop the ANEF.</p>
	<p>Neil Hall – Airservices We have had a number of complaints over the left turn, we have provided a lot of data back to the complainants and back to these forums as to what those spreads look like and it has spread over the years, but in the most recent two years it has remained consistent. In terms of the straight ahead, what I presented when we stopped the trial departure and went back to the original design we changed the initial waypoint from a fly by to a fly over and I said the change would be 60 meters, which it has been. The movement was an extra 60 meters to the East, we have shown at both the ANACC and CACG the trial, pre-trial and post-trial flight paths and they are all very similar and well within the ANEF.</p>
<p>Lindy Smith - Tweed Heads Residents & Ratepayers Association I'm talking about sighting the aircraft, particularly the ones heading north are well outside the contours of both the N70 and the ANEF. I think what is really important that the 2031 ANEF actually incorporated the proposed relocation of the RWY32 landing threshold which is not yet experienced by the community. If the ANEF was developed on the current aircraft as we were advised, where as we have a forecast of significant change.</p>	<p>Brett Curtis – Gold Coast Airport The ANEF has forecast to 2047 in terms on movement numbers with current aircraft types.</p>
<p>Lindy Smith - Tweed Heads Residents & Ratepayers Association There is going to be significant changes because the change in aircraft types and the growth in international flights, where they will have bigger payloads and full fuel loads. We have received 2 reports last year that this does impact on aircraft as they will be lower which will create more noise. In recent months where the Northern track when they are departing RWY14 it is well and truly outside of these contours that have been presented.</p>	<p>Matt Bender – Gold Coast Airport Is this something that you have mapped, or an anecdotal assessment?</p>
<p>Lindy Smith - Tweed Heads Residents & Ratepayers Association</p>	<p>Matt Bender – Gold Coast Airport The primary issue here is that you would like to know</p>

<p>Yes, from sight.</p>	<p>if there is a significant deviation that exists. It is difficult to assess from sight, understanding that you are well used to how things operate there, that would be your major point? I don't know if we can indicate with the spread is there.</p>
<p>Lindy Smith - Tweed Heads Residents & Ratepayers Association You need to reflect that in your ANEF as that is your primary tool used around Australia.</p>	<p>Neil Hall – Airservices Our view is that our tracks are captured in the ANEF and that the future use is also captured.</p>
<p>Lindy Smith - Tweed Heads Residents & Ratepayers Association Where they are currently flying they are outside of the contours.</p>	<p>Neil Hall – Airservices We will provide three months of data for departing aircraft and see if anyone is turning prior to 2 nautical miles.</p>
	<p>Russell McArthur – DIRD I just wish to clarify the purpose of the ANEF is primarily a land use planning tool. In terms of the noise exposure the more meaning full measure is the N70 contours. The ANEI is the actual data inputs from the noise monitoring and aircraft types. The ANEF contours will generally shrink over time as there will be newer aircraft types that are better equipped with new navigation equipment and landing threshold minimums.</p>
	<p>Matt Bender – Gold Coast Airport The noise profile will be fairly steady but the N70 allows you to see the frequency impacts.</p>
<p>Bill Pinkstone - Banora Point & District Residents Association A question on the SID the Cudgen way point is a fly over and the small way point is also a fly over. We understand that the small waypoint was moved easterly by 100 meters but commitments have been given consistently that we have reverted back to the Cudgen fly over waypoint. Are those Southerly and East coordinates the same?</p>	<p>Neil Hall – Airservices Yes, they are the same coordinates. When you have the waypoint name you can't change the coordinates, you have to change the name.</p>
<p>Bill Pinkstone - Banora Point & District Residents Association Those coordinates at Cudgen have reverted back to what they were?</p>	<p>Neil Hall – Airservices Yes, they have reverted back to pre-trial.</p>
<p>Barry Jephcote – SECCA We know the history of the Fly by vs Fly over, East Banora Point were opposed to the trial but as long as the planes any further east of the centreline they said that they would support it. The objective of the trial didn't reach the outcomes of the trial ad it was supposed to revert back to how it was. However it is now a fly over not a fly by point?</p>	<p>Neil Hall – Airservices I have presented to both the ANACC and CACG, the reason why. When we reverted back I gave the explanation that when the aircraft are departing of the runway and there is a fly by weigh point in close to the runway it will not allow the aircraft to be managed by the aircraft systems. Depending on the proximity in some navigation boxes the aircraft starts</p>

	trying to turn earlier. When we looked at the path in a procedure design sense it was within the perimeters of that happening we decided to make it a fly over. We then provided the data that showed the flight track and the spread of the paths.
Barry Jephcote – SECCA Did CASA make the decision?	Neil Hall – Airservices No, it was an Airservices decision.
Lindy Smith - Tweed Heads Residents & Ratepayers Association If it is a different path, then you need to review the ANEF.	Neil Hall – Airservices The tracks are virtually the same, there would be no impact to the ANEF.
Julie Murray – Kingscliff Ratepayers Association Can the pre-trial and the post-trial paths be graphically shown? It is our perception that the planes are flying further east.	Neil Hall – Airservices We have prepared that data for Farrant’s Hill who had similar questions, I will provide that data.
John Hicks – Gold Coast Lifestyle Association Can we please get some dot points on the ILS implementation plan and schedule?	Neil Hall – Airservices I don’t know where we are up to with that, Brett?
	Brett Curtis – Gold Coast Airport We can distribute that after the meeting.

8. Curfew Administration Update

Russell McArthur provided an update on the Curfew Administration Review. Russell also provided a summary of “Aircraft operations during Coolangatta airport curfew Jan – Mar” copies of the summary were distributed to the members.

<u>Question/Discussion</u>	<u>Response</u>
Bill Pinkstone - Banora Point & District Residents Association Who was the operator on the 21 st of March late arrival?	Russell McArthur – DIRD It was a Jetstar arrival using a quota movement and arrived at 11.07pm
Bill Pinkstone - Banora Point & District Residents Association On the 12 business jet movements, obviously none of those are under the RPT jet size?	Russell McArthur – DIRD The requirements for Gold Coast is the aircraft have to be less than 34,000kgs.
Bill Pinkstone - Banora Point & District Residents Association We have a fly neighbourly agreement here with all the operators. It’s the itinerate aircraft that are the issue, but if any of those aircraft are from operators from Gold Coast Airport and if they are signatories to the policy can we ask them to abide by their agreement, or if they aren’t signatories can we ask them to sign up?	Matt Bender – Gold Coast Airport When I get noise complaints that come to the airport directly and generally with GA activities we have more control over the GA activities as opposed to the RPT. I have been in discussions with the tower and operator after a recent complaint that has come through. When these issues are raised to our attention we do chase them up. From my perspective the majority of these are only marginally inside or

	<i>outside of the curfew hours and they are generally international chartered operators. I follow up with the local operators.</i>
Bill Pinkstone - Banora Point & District Residents Association <i>This arose after Air Asia from the previous 3 months, we hear them after midnight in NSW. In this recent period there was only one movement from them.</i>	Russell McArthur – DIRD <i>Part of the impact on the Air Asia is the departure time as it is the last one out.</i>
Bill Pinkstone - Banora Point & District Residents Association <i>There has been no dialogue with Air Asia, but they have definitely improved.</i>	Russell McArthur – DIRD <i>We have had discussions with the manager of Air Asia in Australia and the local manager from Gold Coast attend the session on the requirements are for the curfew procedures. They now have a better understanding of what the procedures are.</i>
Bill Pinkstone - Banora Point & District Residents Association <i>If the feedback could be passed on that we are very pleased with their efforts and that we appreciate it.</i>	Russell McArthur – DIRD <i>There is a website that tries to aggregate aviation complaints “www.aviationcomplaints.com.au” It gives you the breakdown of the different aircraft types and it has links to the respective agencies. It is maintained by the Aviation Safety Authority. It has also recently been updated to have information on drones.</i>
	Matt Bender – Gold Coast Airport <i>If anyone has any suggestions on links that they would like added to the ANACC website.</i>
Bill Pinkstone - Banora Point & District Residents Association <i>I’m sure everyone feels the same, gratitude and thanks to the department for the work that they have placed on these issues since they have been brought up.</i>	

9. General Business

John Hicks Agenda and Strategic Work Program

John has circulated a Strategic Work Program prior to his membership was finalised, I did suggest that as a first point discussed at the committee meeting rather than one organisation giving timeframes of when things should or shouldn’t be achieved. As indicated here, John you have included myself in the responses the comment that I made is not my formal response to this document. I indicated that I was happy for it to be tabled and go through the committee framework. Brett and I will provide a formal response going forward. It is important due to the scope of the document that it be raised here first and everyone given more time to discuss and absorb what is in there.

John Hicks – Gold Coast Lifestyle Association

Based on experience with previous committees I think that the committee would benefit considerably with having a more management centred approach with how we do business. This agenda paper suggests that part of our agenda be framed more strategically which would help us move through these discussions quicker. If we round up all those issues in a framework more aligned with the Terms of Reference and focus on the key things in the TOR and set ourselves up to monitor and meter how we are achieving they key outcomes, without that the committee cannot meet fully the terms of reference. We are under an obligation to provide recommendations to the CACG and elsewhere on those issues. I am recommending this for consideration. These changes will enable ANACC to be more informed and strategic. Working on and monitoring progress would for the foundation of each future ANACC meeting. I can only image how the meeting would have gone today if it was in place. Compliance to curfew information has started to flow and we now have an excellent point of reference. I didn't want to concentrate on the detail of the strategic work plan, I'm more focused on getting a framework that uses more of a management orientated approach for this committee. I value the experience around this table is enormous, the recommendations are there if we want to consider developing a list of priorities in a table to work through. But in order to work through them we need the data. This creates some additional requests for Gold Coast Airport and Airservices in regards to data flow which needs to be navigated. I'm suggesting the best thing we can do is to get together and go through the draft table and put it into a form that is achievable. My recommendation is that we get together in 6 weeks' time and report back to the next ANACC meeting with a more settled version of that table.

Question/Discussion

Response

	<p>Matt Bender – Gold Coast Airport <i>There was a lot of work that you have put into this which we appreciate, the 6 week window is not achievable at this stage as it is a quite extensive document. We will have discussions about what data we can and can't get. In terms of this going forward I am happy for members to respond to the priority issues in your table and it will be an agenda item at the next meeting and we can discuss each point at length in that point in time. You are asking for a significant shift in some things and it does need to go through the committee channel at full. I will talk to Brett and Airservices and have a look at what data can be supplied.</i></p>
<p>John Hicks – Gold Coast Lifestyle Association <i>That is a slight variation of the recommendations, I can't interest you in the working group idea?</i></p>	<p>Matt Bender – Gold Coast Airport <i>Everyone needs to be given opportunity to go through the document.</i></p>
<p>John Hicks – Gold Coast Lifestyle Association <i>I think 6 weeks is enough time. We have ANACC meetings at four month intervals now and there seems to be a long delay without progressing.</i></p>	<p>Matt Bender – Gold Coast Airport <i>Given the scope of the document I don't think the time is appropriate initially, once we know what we can do with it we can expediate things. But for the time being I will add this to next meeting's agenda. I</i></p>

	<i>don't think 6 weeks is achievable given some of the things you have asked for.</i>
John Hicks – Gold Coast Lifestyle Association <i>6 weeks wasn't to do anything like that, it was just to get together to discuss this then people can go away and bring back anything they can to the next meeting.</i>	Matt Bender – Gold Coast Airport <i>Everyone needs time to independently go through the document and bring it back to the committee. Everyone needs to get their own head around it for feedback be it positive or negative.</i>
	Neil Hall – Airservices <i>On your third dot point for Airservices and Gold Coast Airport to form a working group, we haven't discussed that yet as there are resourcing implications to us. We need to figure out what and where we can provide and support.</i>
John Hicks – Gold Coast Lifestyle Association <i>What I am trying to avoid is coming back to the next meeting and that table looks exactly the same. My expectation is that it is plenty of time for all relevant parties to have the discussions they need and come back with something that is feasible. I don't want to come back next time and look at the same table.</i>	Matt Bender – Gold Coast Airport <i>That is what we are looking at doing John. We need to be able to sit here and go through it as a group once everyone has had a chance to go through it.</i>
John Hicks – Gold Coast Lifestyle Association <i>I'm suggesting that to happen as a working group between sessions. It's inappropriate to tie this meeting up with blow by blow highly detailed discussions of each row that's why I suggested the working group. Maybe the way forward is for Airservices and Gold Coast Airport to get together and when you have an idea on your position send an invite out to any interested members to come along. I don't have the information, you guys do. We need to be prepared to work between meetings to shake these things up.</i>	Matt Bender – Gold Coast Airport <i>I don't have a problem with the principle, as Neil said we will have discussions as to what we can achieve going forward. Once we have discussed that we will keep people in the loop. I will give everyone the chance to go through it and discuss it at the next meeting.</i>
Bill Pinkstone - Banora Point & District Residents Association <i>I support the principal because it will be beneficial. When we dropped from 4 meetings a year to 3 meetings we adopted the fact that we would have progress provided between meetings instead of just at the meetings. I think John's enthusiasm is wonderful but the structure of this it's touching on the fact that a newcomer to the meetings that it is a long time between information. Maybe we can think about having a report in between meetings which will cut down the time at meetings. If the organisations could provide feedback in bi-monthly report it would be beneficial.</i>	Matt Bender – Gold Coast Airport <i>I have never doubted the relevance, but we will discuss this with Airservices.</i>
Barry Jephcote – SECCA	Neil Hall – Airservices

<i>Neil this new track coming in when would it be put in place, how long has it been considered for?</i>	<i>We are proposing 9 November and we have been considering it for 18 months.</i>
Barry Jephcote – SECCA <i>Has it been presented to the committees?</i>	Neil Hall – Airservices <i>Similarly to how I presented today we will present to the CACG and that is before we publish this. If there is feedback from any of these meetings I will take it personally.</i>
Barry Jephcote – SECCA <i>Can I request through the chair, the concentration of the planes will impact East Banora. Can I request that we have a temporary Noise Monitor sometime in the next three months so we can track the noise and then replaced later on to verify the data?</i>	Neil Hall – Airservices <i>The issues when you don't get any planes what will it verify?</i>
Barry Jephcote – SECCA <i>I'll be taking this back to my committees but looking at the paths it looks like East Banora will get inundated.</i>	Neil Hall – Airservices <i>The noise contours will be no difference in noise compared to what they get now.</i>

Airport Development Update

Brett Curtis provided a quick update to the Committee:

- Master Plan

The Master Plan is currently awaiting the Ministers approval, which we are expecting in mid-July.

A full detailed Airport Development update will be provided to the CACG meeting.

Question/Discussion

Response

Brad Pearce – Tweed Shire Council <i>We received a complaint from a resident in Kingscliff from things that were discussed today regarding curfew and departures, in my response I would bring it to the committees attention. If Airservices could provide further detail</i>	Matt Bender – Gold Coast Airport <i>If you wish to forward the complaint to me I will be happy to respond as well.</i>
	Neil Hall – Airservices <i>I will investigate as well.</i>

The Chair reminded the Committee of the remaining meeting dates for 2017:

– 26th October

The Chair closed the meeting at 12.21 pm.

ANACC COMMITTEE ACTIONS - Next Meeting Thursday 26th October

Date	Action Item	Action Officer	Status	Action	Complete Date
27 Oct 16 23 Feb 17 22 June 17	Aircraft noise over West Kingscliff	Airservices	CLOSED	ASA to follow up on planes flying further east over West Kingscliff Neil to cover in his presentation and information distributed.	22 June 17
23 Feb 17 22 June 17	Airport Curfew Numbers	DIRD	CLOSED	Statistics of all the afterhours aircraft Russell McArthur provided an update	22 June 17
26 May 16 22 June 17	Noise Monitor Location	Airservices	CLOSED	Distance from the airport to small and the ground location of small is, as well as the height. Neil responded in his presentation	22 June 17
26 Feb 15 22 Jun 17	Reinstatement of Permanent Noise Monitors	Airservices	CLOSED	ASA to follow-up the re-instatement of permanent noise monitors and provide feedback to the committee. Neil responded in his presentation	22 June 17
16 Jun 11 19 Mar 12 8 Jun 12 13 Sept 12 6 Dec 12 28 Feb 13 25 July 13 31 Oct 13 27 Feb 14 5 Jun 14 30 Oct 14	ANACC Northern Membership	Brett Curtis	OPEN	BCurtis to meet with GThrelfall to discuss northern members and define territories. BCurtis advised will be taken into consideration during TOR review. TOR will be reviewed & submitted to the committee by 1 July. Committee to discuss at September meeting. 1 Vacant position for both southern/northern ends. BCurtis to discuss with PDonovan membership requirements Chair will follow up on this action item in 2013 Chair has made contact with RWorkman, & info pack sent out. Chair to meet with Ron to finalise membership. Northern Membership will be finalised as part of the membership renewal process. RWorkman is available but needs to be voted in be a community group. Two potential northern groups have been identified through CACG restructure, discussions will be held in an attempt to secure a northern representative for ANACC. Broadbeach Neighbourhood Watch has been approached to provide a representative. Northern member still required. It is hoped someone will be identified	

26 Feb 15 25 Jun 15 29 Oct 15 25 Feb 16 30 Mar 16 27 Oct 16				<p>through the upcoming ILS community consultation process. Northern membership continues to be sought preferably from the Mermaid Beach region.</p> <p>The Chair noted a number of potential candidates have been identified to the north, a decision on the northern representative will not be made until a determination on the approval of ILS. A potential candidate has been identified by Bill Pinkstone to fill the southern position representing the Bilambil/Terranora area and this will be investigated further.</p> <p>Chair advised this action will be on hold until a decision is reached on the ILS.</p> <p>The Chair advised that the ILS has been approved as of 19 Jan. The chair met with the Northern ANACC Members to discuss potential candidates.</p> <p>Awaiting decision from the AAT on the approval of the ILS.</p>	
22 June 17	2015 Noise Monitor Data	Airservices	OPEN	Airservices to provide a more detailed report on the 2015 Noise Data from Fingal Heads.	
22 June 17	Noise Report	Airservices	OPEN	Airservices to spilt data between East Banora and West Banora	
22 June 17	Contour Data	Airservices	OPEN	Airservices to provide 3 months of data to validate aircraft turning earlier then 2 nautical miles.	
22 June 17	Pre and Post-trial data	Airservices	OPEN	Airservices to prove the Pre During and Post-trial data for review.	