

Brisbane Airport Community Airspace Advisory Board (AAB)

Meeting Minutes

DATE	LOCATION
19 November 2025	Brisbane Airport Conference Centre – Pullman Hotel
MEETING TITLE: Brisbane Airport Community Airspace Advisory Board Meeting 10	
MEETING TIME: START TIME – 12.30 END TIME – 15:00	

Attendees

Name	Position
Kim Jordan	Chair – Brisbane Airport Community Airspace Advisory Board (AAB)
Tess Bignell	Community Representative
Stephen Muller	Community Representative
Janelle Moody	Community Representative
Matthew Loveday	Community Representative
Jacqui O’Dea	Airservices Australia – Chief Risk, Noise and Environment Officer
Donna Marshall	Airservices Australia – Head of Community Engagement
Richard Foley-Lewis	Airservices Australia – A/g Head of Brisbane Aerodrome & Airspace Services
Tim Boyle	Brisbane Airport Corporation – Head of Airspace Management
Luke Van Dongen	Virgin Australia – Fleet Manager
Dave McCutcheon	Qantas Freight – Deputy Chief Pilot
Sarah Nattey	Assistant Secretary, Airports Branch, Domestic Aviation and Reform, Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development, Communications, Sport and the Arts (DITRDCA)
Andrew Marshall	Director, QLD, SA and NT Airports, Airports Branch, DITRDCA
Rachel Lee	Secretariat, DITRDCA
Tara Ironside	Secretariat, DITRDCA

Apologies

- Craig Charker – Airservices Australia – Head of Network Planning & Optimisation
- Alex Tikoft – Airservices Australia – Head of Airspace and Aerodrome Services (Brisbane)

Minutes

Agenda Item 1: Welcome and Acknowledgement of Country

The Chair, Kim Jordan, opened the meeting at 12:30 PM and welcomed members and industry advisors. She acknowledged the traditional Custodians of the land on which Brisbane Airport is located, the Turrbal people, and paid respects to Elders past and present. She also acknowledged Traditional Owners across Australia.

The Chair noted the Victorian Parliament has recently passed Treaty legislation and noted the Wurundjeri people have filed a native title claim which covers much of Melbourne (Naarm).

Agenda Item 2: Administration

Kim introduced the meeting.

David McCutcheon, Luke Van Dongen, Stephen Muller and Andrew Marshall attended the meeting virtually.

Administration

- Kim noted she has been advised that Peter Curran, Airservices' Deputy Chief Executive Officer, will no longer attend AAB meetings. Jacqui O'Dea, Chief Risk, Noise and Environment Officer, will attend in his place.
 - Alex Tikoft, Head of Airspace and Aerodrome Services (Brisbane) was a late apology. Kim thanked Richard Foley-Lewis, A/g Head of Brisbane Aerodrome & Airspace Services for attending on behalf of Alex.
 - Kim noted Craig Charker was not in attendance and reflected disappointment.
 - Kim advised she had a brief discussion with AAB community members before the meeting. She noted there is some frustration with the purpose of the AAB, and an apparent lack of Ministerial priority.
 - Kim noted most attendees would be aware that David Diamond has resigned from the AAB with immediate effect. (David's letter of resignation is included as *Attachment B*). She expressed appreciation for David's considerable contributions since the AAB was established.
 - Kim advised the meeting would need to conclude at 3:00 pm sharp since the only flight connection to Melbourne was rather tight this meeting.
-

Agenda Item 3: Action items

The Action Items list is at Attachment A.

The Chair ran through the action item list and noted the following with regard to action items that were not related to Airservices Australia (Airservices):

- For **Action Item 1.1**, the item would continue to remain open until the Route Growth Forecasts are published by Brisbane Airport Corporation (BAC).
 - For **Action Items 3.4 / 3.8**, the items would remain open until any feedback on papers provided by Think Research circulated out of session is provided by community representatives.
 - For **Action Item 5.1**, Airline Representatives would present on fleet upgrades at Agenda Item 7.
 - For **Action Item 9.2**, the Chair asked Janelle Moody, Community Representative, if she would like to provide the complaint responses she had noted during the last meeting. Janelle noted that the last
-

response she had received through the NCIS referenced her status as an AAB member, and that this was inappropriate, as she had engaged with the NCIS in a private capacity. Donna Marshall, Airservices Australia – Head of Community Engagement, agreed that this was not appropriate if the complaint was raised in a private capacity. Janelle agreed to send the response through to the Secretariat for sharing with Airservices out of session.

- For **Action Item 9.8**, BAC would provide any updates during Agenda Item 6.

Agenda Item 4: Community member issues – raised prior to meeting

The Chair noted that responses to issues raised prior to the meeting had been provided out of session, and there would be an opportunity to discuss during *Agenda Item 8*, or for any follow-up queries to be raised out of session.

The group used the *Agenda Item* to discuss the Australian Government’s response to the *Senate Inquiry into the Impact and Mitigation on Aircraft Noise*:

- Matthew Loveday, Community Representative, noted the Australian Government’s response to the *Senate Inquiry into the Impact and Mitigation on Aircraft Noise* had been published.
- Matthew asked Sarah Nattey, Assistant Secretary, Airports Branch, Domestic Aviation and Reform, Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development, Communications, Sport and the Arts (DITRDCA) whether the department’s views of the inquiry and the recommendations matched the views of the government.
- Sarah clarified that the department’s role is not to have a view, but to provide advice to the government and the Minister. Sarah noted that the Senate Inquiry had outlined the policy position of the Senators that led the Inquiry, whereas the government’s response outlined the policy position of the government. The government had reiterated policy positions outlined in other documents, such as the *Aviation White Paper – Towards 2050*, in its response.

Agenda Item 5: Airservices update

Donna Marshall, Head of Community Engagement, Airservices provided the presentation included as *Attachment C*.

Donna ran through the action item list and noted the following:

- For **Action Item 3.4** and **Action Item 3.8**, items would remain open until any feedback on papers provided by Think Research circulated out of session is provided by community representatives.
- For **Action Item 9.1**, the briefing session was held in September 2025, and any feedback from community representatives on papers provided by Think Research could be provided in response to **Action Item 3.4** and **Action Item 3.8**.
- **Action Item 8.2**, **Action Item 9.3**, **Action Item 9.4** and **Action Item 9.5** would be presented on during the update.

Donna noted Airservices had addressed matters raised by Community Representatives out of session or to be discussed in the meeting:

- Tess Bignell, Community Representative, noted Airservices had misinterpreted her out of session request for slides. Donna agreed to send the correct slides via the Secretariat.
 - Janelle Moody, Community Representative, questioned why the complete slide deck could not be distributed to the community.
 - Donna explained it was not that Airservices did not want the information shared, but that the information needs appropriate caveats when not presented in person, to avoid misinterpretation.
 - Janelle questioned the New Farm marker point on one of the slides and questioned what this meant.
-

-
- Donna suggested it was likely a suburb marker from Google. She will check and confirm.
 - Donna emphasised that if community members would like access any information discussed in the AAB meetings that is not published alongside minutes, they could seek agreement to this via the Secretariat.

Action Item 8.2 – Examine D’Aguilar National Park

- Donna referred to her presentation and explained that Airservices had been asked to assess whether the SMOKA arrival path from the north and the WOODY arrival path from the west could be repositioned so that flights moved more over D’Aguilar National Park over less populated areas.
- Donna noted the WACKO departure point could potentially be moved closer to RAAF Base Amberley without raising defence airspace concerns.
- However, relocating the arrival paths would result in flight path separation issues, and moving the waypoint further west would prevent the required separation from being achieved, which would conflict with WACKO departures and flight path improvements proposed during Package Three.
- Tess noted that it was not worth realigning the WACKO flight path closer to Amberley Airspace border given the proposed improvements in Package Three for community resulted in much higher overflight altitudes and flight path separation of arrivals and departures over the north western communities resulted in an overall reduction of noise for those overflown.

The group discussed the item:

- Kim invited David McCutcheon, Qantas Freight Deputy Chief Pilot, to provide his views. David had no specific comments but agreed that relocating the points would present challenges in terms of flight separation and that there was no simple solution.
- Donna confirmed that at this stage, moving SMOKA and WOODY further west was not a viable option, however Airservices will continue to explore alternative solutions.

Action Item 9.3 – Revised KPI and Outcome Data

Jacqui O’Dea, Chief Risk, Noise and Environment Officer, Airservices Australia, led a discussion of metrics published in the latest quarterly update.

- Donna presented outcomes data demonstrating the results of recent Airservices changes, noting this had been published on the *Noise Action Plan for Brisbane* website as part of the most recent quarterly update.
- Donna advised that comparisons for Simultaneous Opposite Direction Parallel Runway Operations (SODPROPS) had been made between similar months (based on weather conditions) before and after changes to assess improvements. Donna sought feedback from members on the usefulness of this data.

The group discussed the item, and ongoing concerns about implementation of the *Noise Action Plan for Brisbane*:

- Matt referred to the resignation of community member David Diamond and noted this reflected community concerns regarding the published KPIs.
 - Donna advised that while some improvements had been observed, overall outcomes continued to be influenced by increasing air traffic.
 - Janelle noted the limited use of SODPROPS and expressed dissatisfaction regarding ongoing constraints which reduced its viability.
 - Tess noted that while the metrics suggested that there had been a lot of work and improvements, she felt that the situation had really only improved with the November 2024 changes to flight paths over the Redlands.
 - Jacqui advised that Airservices had substantiated some improvements resulting from recent changes and acknowledged the impact of increasing aircraft movements. Jacqui noted that Airservices had
-

identified groups of communities that had experienced improvement, no change, or worsening outcomes, and confirmed this information would be shared later in the presentation.

- Tess further noted that benefits to date had largely been observed in coastal and inner-city by the use of the turbo prop early turn, with no improvement reported for the northwest or for areas affected by the south/legacy runway.
- Matt noted increasing noise concerns, a lack of improvement in departures, limited proposed improvement in Package 3, and continued growth in arrivals.
- Steve Muller, Community Representative, emphasised that there were still community impacts being experienced in the Redlands, and that he wanted to refute the view that only the Redlands community had experienced benefits to date.
- Steve reported substantial noise impacts from flights to southern capitals during northerly wind conditions, particularly in January and February 2025, and subsequently September and October 2025. Steve noted aircraft were tracking over populated areas of the Redlands at 4,000–6,000 feet, which he considered to be a deterioration compared to the period before the November 2024 flight path and operational changes. Steve also noted increased turboprop traffic and arrivals from Adelaide and Perth affecting his community. Steve felt that this experience did not reflect the increased height KPI's that Airservices had noted in the presentation.
- Matt asked whether any measures could be explored to address increasing air traffic. He also noted community interest in multiple arrival paths under Package Four to support respite.
- The Chair noted that Package Four would be discussed later in the agenda, and concluded the discussion by returning to matters relating to KPIs and the metrics Airservices had presented.

The group discussed the KPI and metrics data:

- Donna continued to present the KPI and metrics data, and requested feedback on the slide, asking whether the November 2025 program update data was useful.
- Kim noted the slides were difficult to read and advised that it would be preferable for Airservices to provide slides at least one week prior to meetings.
- Donna explained the information presented was drawn from the quarterly update available on the *Noise Action Plan for Brisbane* website. She noted that if the current presentation structure is not meeting community needs, Airservices is open to adjusting future updates, and further noted that the quarterly update was issued with an alert to subscribers via the *Noise Action Plan for Brisbane* website.
- The Chair asked whether any feedback had been submitted by the community.
- Donna advised community feedback had been provided on various aspects of the quarterly update, but none had related to the format or structure of the reporting.
- Tess noted feedback from her community was that, while Airservices had undertaken a lot of work, none of the actions had yet resulted in any significant change.
- Donna requested community members review the information circulated by the Secretariat and provide any feedback.
- The Chair noted that more specific, dot-point style questions would assist community members in providing targeted feedback. Donna agreed that more framed questions could be provided through the Secretariat for member consideration.
- Janelle noted the quarterly update is difficult to read due to formatting and font, and that the wider community may also find it challenging to navigate. Janelle emphasised that the metrics were very dense, and high level, and there were substantial opportunities for improvement.
- Jacqui acknowledged Janelle's feedback, though explained that she preferred to keep the current format for the time being: the website requires a lot of revision more broadly and rather than making incremental changes, Airservices intended to undertake a more comprehensive update.
- Jacqui noted that Airservices would like to progress a major piece of work to simplify Airservices web resources, cleaning them all up and making them more useful and accessible to people.
- Jacqui advised that Airservices will award a the contract for its noise and flight path monitoring system in early 2026, with the successful contractor in place by August 2026. Jacqui acknowledged the website is not user-friendly and agreed that improvements are needed.
- Kim agreed that there were substantial opportunities for improvement.

Action Item 9.4 – Package Four Queries

- Donna referenced the slide outlining the breakdown of Package Four, explaining that noise sharing and respite modes had been separated into distinct components.

Package Four (Noise Sharing)

The group discussed the item:

- Steve commented that noise sharing appeared to shift noise impacts from one community to another and expressed concern that there must be better options. Steve noted that such measures should only be used as a last resort.
 - Donna confirmed that noise sharing does involve shifting noise between communities. Donna questioned whether noise sharing would be accepted by all sections of the community, noting that significant feedback had been received during Phase Six.
 - Tess responded that communities needed clear information about the level of impact they may experience and are unlikely to be supportive of changes without this understanding.
 - Tess queried whether implementing Package Four would mean losing improvements achieved in Package Three.
 - Donna advised that this was not necessarily the case, emphasising Airservices did not want to undo improvements but rather maximise overall benefits.
 - Kim noted this information was useful. She emphasised it seemed clear from community feedback that Package Three improvements should not be undone.
 - Donna added that the only circumstance where improvements already implemented may be reconsidered is if TRAX identifies a better overall solution.
 - The Chair asked whether any potential changes would avoid disadvantaging those who had received benefits under Package Three.
 - Donna confirmed the intent was that there would be no disbenefit to those who had received an improvement from other Noise Action Plan for Brisbane deliverables, noting she has not yet seen the details of Package Four.
 - Jacqui highlighted the need for feedback from community representatives to understand how important it is that those who have received benefits under Package Three retain those benefits.
 - Matt noted that as the airport is a community asset, the broader community should share in both the benefits and the impacts, and that it is unreasonable for the community to expect to share only the benefits without also sharing the problems and impacts.
 - The Chair noted the Minister has been clear that noise sharing is an approach that will be adopted in managing Brisbane Airport's noise.
 - Steve noted it was still important that people's experiences actually match the apparent proposed improvements.
 - The Chair noted it was important that changes the community has appropriate expectations of be implemented effectively, and that this issue is a key aspect requiring further discussion.
 - Matt queried Donna regarding the noise sharing actions, specifically asking whether all elements within it were for low-capacity modes.
 - Donna responded that as a general rule, noise-sharing modes are low capacity, and provided an example that deviating from compass operations may not be possible during peak periods, as compass operations are required when there are simultaneous arrivals and departures. Donna noted that during such times, independent parallel runway operations could be used, and compass operations must be in place to support that level of traffic.
 - Matt suggested Airservices needs to ensure expectations on the use of these modes are clearly communicated, including certainty around timeframes.
 - Donna noted the use of noise-sharing options is subject to change based on traffic and capacity requirements.
 - Kim and Janelle both noted it was important to clearly specify what peak times and off-peak times would be.
-

-
- Donna said strict hours would not be set, rather it would be based on thresholds similar to SODPROPS—for example, where SODPROPS cannot accommodate more than 20 arrivals in the system.
 - Jacqui advised she would welcome the opportunity to discuss the principles guiding Airservices' consideration of Package Four, including how Packages Three and Four interact, and what expectations exist for communities that have either benefited or been adversely affected by Package Three.
 - Janelle asked whether the items presented were the only changes being proposed in Package Four.
 - Donna referred to her presentation and confirmed that the items shown were the only actionable flight path changes in Package Four. The only additional item was a recommendation from Package Two to examine the broader southeast Queensland basin, which would now be considered as part of Package Four.
 - Janelle noted there still appeared to be no benefits for New Farm or Bulimba and reiterated that Airservices was still not addressing cumulative impacts, and did not appear to be considering existing ambient noise impacts in considering flight path changes.
 - Janelle also questioned why certain options were available during adverse weather but not implemented during normal conditions.
 - Janelle emphasised she does not consider population overflow is a useful metric for the Brisbane context.
 - Kim observed that population overflow was being used as a key metric and was unlikely to be able to be re-prosecuted at this stage of the process.
 - Donna noted Airservices was considering cumulative impacts, and gave an example that some of the northern flight paths are overflying more people overall but deliver better outcomes for some of the communities most heavily affected by noise.
 - Donna added that Airservices is still investigating the potential to offset the runway aligned departure path from the new runway and advised that updates would likely be available in the first part of 2026.

Package Four (Respite modes)

The group continued to discuss the item:

- Matt asked whether respite modes were only being considered for arrivals or if departures would also be included, and the reasoning behind this.
- Donna advised the recommendation was originally framed around arrivals only but asked the group whether they would be interested in Airservices and Trax examining departures as well.
- Community members agreed they would very much like departures to be included.
- Richard Foley-Lewis, Acting Head of Brisbane Aerodrome & Airspace Services, Airservices Australia explained that it is generally easier to examine arrival routes than departure routes, as arrivals converge to a single point whereas departures disperse in multiple directions, particularly where non-jet aircraft need to be tracked clear of faster following jets.
- Kim noted the group did not want departures removed from consideration simply because they were not explicitly mentioned in the original recommendation.
- Matt asked whether Airservices had discussed this with Trax.
- Donna advised she had been in discussion with Trax, who confirmed that they could examine departure options if asked.
- Richard noted there may be operational challenges which would limit implementation of modes for departures, as departures are technically more complex to plan for, particularly when considering split operational modes and changeovers.
- Donna summarised the key points of the discussion, noting:
 - The group expected that Package Four retain benefits realised under Package Three;
 - Departure respite modes should be investigated;
 - Cumulative impacts must be clearly considered; and
 - Benefits and disbenefits of any proposed change must be transparently shown.
- Kim added the importance of understanding how relative ambient noise is assessed.

Further discussion around KPIs, metrics and information sources

Donna continued the presentation:

- Donna noted current runway usage information is available on the BAC website.
- Donna also noted Airservices' website displays noise abatement procedure reporting; however, this data is largely point-in-time and cannot yet demonstrate meaningful change over time.
- Donna noted they were looking at opportunities to better show changes over time, and asked the group to think how they would like longer term trends to be represented, which could be considered further out of session.
- Donna provided clarification regarding recent Senate Estimates statements that "some areas within Brisbane airspace have experienced noise improvements", noting Airservices has observed improvements in certain areas resulting from changes such as the increased use of SODPROPS.
- Steve noted his community was satisfied with the *intent* of the 28 November 2024 flight path changes, but expressed frustration that SODPROPS usage did not appear to be at the level anticipated by the Minister's Direction.
- Kim noted Steve's point highlighted an important principle— that benefits delivered under Package 3 should not later be withdrawn, as communities had responded positively when changes were first introduced.
- Steve added that just because a change appears positive initially, it may not remain in place or be as effective as initially expected in operation.
- Donna noted Airservices had identified several reasons why certain elements may not be functioning as intended, and they were looking at options to address these.

Communities where noise improvements have been identified

Donna continued with her presentation:

- Donna spoke to the presented slide, outlining improved noise outcomes for East and North-East Brisbane communities resulting from changes to early-morning non-jet operations and the introduction of additional segregation modes.
- Donna noted South-West Brisbane communities have also experienced improved noise outcomes from additional segregation modes.
- Donna explained Northern Island communities, including Bribie Island, have seen improvements due to shifting the 01L (new runway over water) WACKO departure path to 01R (legacy runway over water).
- David showed an aeronautical chart demonstrating that aircraft on the 01L and 01R WACKO SID clear 10,000 feet over North Stradbroke Island, approximately 40 miles before WACKO, cross WACKO around mid-20,000 feet, and cross the edge of the bay at approximately 15,000 feet.
- The group noted this information was helpful.
- Donna advised Southern Island communities, including Dunwich, have experienced improved noise outcomes due to moving the 01R (legacy runway over water) SCOTT departure path further north.
- Donna acknowledged that while some communities have received reduced noise impacts, others have not benefited. Donna noted SODPROPS delivers the greatest benefit but not to the extent Brisbane communities are seeking.

Noise Action Plan for Brisbane – Implementation Reconciliation

Donna presented an overview of *Noise Action Plan for Brisbane* actions that had been completed to date.

- Airservices has a total of 82 actions under the *Noise Action Plan for Brisbane*, with 51 relating to flight path or procedural changes and the remainder relating to reporting, general guidance, community consultation and safety assessments.
 - As of 30 September 2025, Airservices has addressed 64 of the 82 actions, with 28 fully completed.
 - Four additional actions have recently been completed, with outcomes to be announced prior to December 2025.
 - 13 actions were subject to the most recent round of Package 3 engagement, with decisions expected before June 2026.
 - Three actions remain in progress and are subject to ongoing investigation.
-

-
- 19 governance and guidance actions have been acquitted.
 - 15 actions relate to Package 4 and are currently in progress.
 - This leaves 18 actions remaining to be delivered.

The group discussed the presentation:

- Janelle asked how she could access further detail beyond what was shown on the slide.
- Donna asked what level of detail Janelle was seeking.
- Janelle emphasised that while the slide was valuable, given the ongoing implementation of the *Noise Action Plan for Brisbane* was central to the AAB's Terms of Reference, more detailed information would be beneficial, particularly information which identifies each action and detail of its status individually.
- Donna confirmed that a more detailed breakdown on the 82 actions can be provided prior to the next meeting.
- Janelle advised her community would like clarity on what remains to be delivered under the *Noise Action Plan for Brisbane*.

Package Three Update (Action Item 9.5 – Phase Six Communications)

Donna provided a Package Three update, noting Airservices is working through community feedback:

- Donna noted that TRAX is reviewing all feedback against each of the preferred options presented, with outcomes to be shared in the first half of 2026.
 - Tess requested a more defined timeframe, noting the community needs clarity on how long implementation will take.
 - Jacqui advised Airservices is targeting June 2026 for decisions, with implementation expected to take 12–18 months. She noted this was the timeline Airservices provided during the most recent Senate Estimates hearing.
 - Donna confirmed that once outcomes are announced, Airservices will provide a timeframe for each action.
 - Tess observed the Brisbane community is at breaking point.
 - Tess queried whether these timeframes meant implementation of some flight path changes could occur as late as 2028.
 - Jacqui confirmed this was the case.
 - Matt questioned why the mid 2026 trial for departures over land at night (outlined in Package Three Option Four) could not be brought forward.
 - Donna advised the timing was due to previous commitments made by BAC to the community around the Noise Abatement Procedure.
 - Tim advised the BAC executive team remains strongly committed to the Noise Abatement Procedure, and changing it now would be considered significant.
 - Matt questioned whether the new runway flight paths passes over any communities.
 - Tim confirmed that under the Noise Abatement Procedure, the new runway is not used for arrivals or departures between 10:00 pm and 6:00 am.
 - Matt expressed dissatisfaction, questioning why a pause or trial cannot proceed if the flight path does not overfly communities.
 - Tess asked whether the request could be escalated to the Minister.
 - Tim explained this is a BAC matter, not one for the Minister.
 - Tim confirmed BAC has considered the issue and will not amend the Noise Abatement Procedure due to its commitment to communities affected by the new runway.
 - Matt expressed confusion, noting the early turn does not pass over communities.
 - Tim advised some communities may still experience noise and the turn would not be silent.
 - Donna further explained that even when aircraft do not directly overfly communities, residents may still be impacted by noise from the aircraft belly during turns, which is why a trial is being considered.
 - Tess asked whether any noise footprint mapping had been completed.
 - Tim confirmed that mapping has been undertaken.
-

Actions

1. Airservices Australia to send through correct slides with explanatory material from the Questions arising from the Phase Six briefing slide deck to the Secretariat for sharing with community representatives, and to confirm the basis of New Farm marker point included in the slide deck.
2. Airservices Australia to send through revised KPI and outcomes data with framing questions to seek targeted feedback from community representatives, to be circulated by the Secretariat.
3. Airservices Australia to provide more detailed breakdown on implementation status and outcome for each of the actions under the *Noise Action Plan for Brisbane*.

Agenda Item 6: Brisbane Airport Corporation update

Tim Boyle gave an update on the Brisbane Airport preliminary draft Master Plan:

- Tim noted a response to **Action Item 9.7** had been circulated following the AAB meeting held on 27 August 2025 and asked if members had any further questions in relation to media queries received on the draft master plan.
- The group had no further queries in relation to **Action Item 9.7**.
- Janelle noted the master plan consultation website did not specify when submissions closed.
- Kim observed that providing a closing date can result in late, low-quality submissions.
- Kim suggested adding a caveat to the website advising that early feedback has the best chance of being considered.
- Tim acknowledged this, agreeing this was something BAC could look at for similar processes in the future. Tim noted that he had previously advised that submissions would close at the end of October 2025.

Tim gave an update on the Tailwind Safety Case trial:

- BAC is ready to commence the tailwind trial, aiming for a public announcement on 1 December 2025.
- BAC has worked with Airservices, CASA and airlines to finalise an agreed approach.
- The trial will run for 18 months, with a public statement to be released shortly and reporting to occur throughout.
- BAC would meet with airlines in the coming week, and airlines will have seven days' notice to brief their crews.
- Significant results are unlikely in the early months due to seasonal weather.
- Tim thanked members for their patience.
- Matt requested that the weather context be communicated to the community as part of the public statement.
- Tim acknowledged this would be included in public communications.
- Tess sought clarification on the rules and regulations of the trial, asking whether the tailwind limit would be up to 10 knots.
- Tim advised there will be no fixed limit, though he anticipated there would be a lot of uptake at tailwind speeds of up to 6–7 knots, and a lower uptake above those speeds.
- Donna noted actual uptake will depend on individual pilots and airline policy.

Agenda Item 7: Airline Representatives

David McCutcheon and Luke Van Dongen shared a presentation on fleet upgrades and technology improvements.

A copy of the presentation is included as *Attachment D*.

David presented on technology improvements and Qantas fleet upgrades:

- The first half of his presentation focused on generational changes in aircraft types, with the second half addressing developments within the Qantas Group.
- David noted Luke may wish to address Virgin Australia developments separately, as some of Virgin's incoming aircraft types were included in the initial overview.
- David explained there has been a reduction in aircraft noise over time which had been driven by technological improvements, much of it due to advances in engine technology.
- Jacqui asked whether engine technology improvements were specifically driven by a desire to reduce noise or whether noise reduction was a by-product of a focus on carbon dioxide emissions reductions.
- David responded that the drivers include a combination of factors: fuel efficiency, lower emissions, reduced noise footprint and aircraft design changes. David noted that engines are certified as part of the wider aircraft design package, resulting in improvements across fuel burn, emissions and noise.
- Jacqui thanked David and noted she wanted to understand how industry priorities influence noise reduction.
- David advised that, while he could not speak on behalf of manufacturers, he expected that Airbus and Boeing both identify emissions, fuel burn and noise as key focus areas. David noted the aircraft manufacturers design the airframe, not the engine, but work closely with engine manufacturers and set performance targets.
- David emphasised that for airlines, noise is a critical factor for gaining operational approvals at airports worldwide.
- Steve asked David about an article in Engineers Australia magazine regarding engines with exposed bypass fans, which suggested improved fuel efficiency, although other sources indicated higher noise levels.
- David noted he could not respond on behalf of Qantas or aircraft manufacturers, but only from a personal perspective. David explained that engines with exposed bypass fans for jet aircraft have been proposed since around 1987, originally for late DC-9 variants (later the 717). David noted the technology has undergone multiple test programs and reviews and said it is unclear which direction manufacturers will pursue in the long term.
- David explained some ducted fan engines do not perform as well for jet aircraft for a few reasons:
 - Traditional cowl engines have Kevlar or similar material inside to catch a blade if it breaks, keeping it from exiting the engine. Ducted fan engines do not have this protection, so a broken blade could be dangerous.
 - Ducted fans have a higher risk from bird strikes because of their larger fan area.
 - High altitude performance is another factor. Cowl engines work better in thin air, while propeller blades are less efficient at high altitudes.
- Tess asked David whether the graph shown in the presentation represents only engine noise or the full aircraft noise footprint.
- David explained the graph shows the overall noise footprint, which combines all sources. While aircraft aerodynamics contribute, the main factor from roughly the 1980s onwards is changes to engines.
- Tess asked if there is any data distinguishing the pitch output of different aircraft, noting that the Airbus A330 has a pitch that is often perceived by the community as problematic.
- David advised pitch varies significantly between individual aircraft, making it difficult to summarise by model. Some analyses have been done, but results are inconsistent.
- David continued with his presentation, discussing the noise footprint comparison between the A321 Neo and A321 CEO at Sydney Airport runway 34L.
- David noted that the A321 Neo has a higher take-off weight of 97 tonnes compared with 93 tonnes for the A321 CEO.

David provided an update on the current status of new fleet additions for Qantas Group:

- Qantas have a total of 128 aircraft in the Airbus A320 and A220 family on order, with 171 options.
 - Nine A220-300 aircraft had been delivered over the past 19 months, with one scheduled for delivery the weekend of 24 November 2025 and an additional aircraft expected just prior to Christmas.
-

-
- 30 A320/321 NEO aircraft have been delivered over the past three years (including five A320s, 22 A321 LRs, and three A321 XLRs), with four more expected by the end of 2025.
 - Qantas expects 12 A350-1000 aircraft would be delivered from mid-2026.
 - Overall, 39 newer technology aircraft have been delivered into the Qantas Group over the past three years, with additional narrowbody orders largely replacing existing 737-800s and older A320/A321 aircraft.

The group discussed the Qantas fleet upgrades:

- Steve asked if other freight or smaller operators were retaining older aircraft.
- David noted he could not comment outside the Qantas Group, but that Qantas Freight was included in the fleet numbers quoted.
- Matt asked how many years it would take for the fleet to achieve ICAO Chapter 14 compliance.
- David explained exact timing is uncertain due to COVID-19 delays, but net zero targets and natural attrition will drive fleet changes. Historically, Jetstar's fleet age averages around seven years, mainline Qantas 12–13 years, and other operators similar. Major turnover is expected in the 2030s.

Luke gave an overview on Virgin fleet upgrades:

- Virgin's average fleet age is six to seven years.
- COVID-19 has caused manufacturing backlogs, which had resulted in delays in Virgin getting the Boeing 737 Max aircraft it had ordered.
- The newer planes are more likely to be used for long-haul routes in the first instance, rather than on the busier arrival and departure routes.
- The new fleet will mean Virgin will be better able to manage expected operational changes, including new SIDs and STARs, and any associated longer track miles, and are expected to reduce fuel use and emissions.
- David emphasised the technology for narrowbody aircraft is only around six years old.

Agenda Item 8: Other Business

The Chair ran through the proposed 2026 meeting dates, noting the first meeting was tentatively scheduled for Wednesday 18 March 2026.

Noting the time, the Chair requested that the secretariat consolidate actions for circulation before the minutes, and organise an out of session catch-up with Community Representatives to discuss meeting logistics for 2026.

Jacqui made a point about Airservices' attendees for the meeting and noted that they have had some staffing changes but will notify the secretariat who will be coming moving forward.

Janelle questioned if the AAB was required to develop an annual report. Kim confirmed the Chair was required to provide an annual report to the Minister, that drafting of the report was in train, and that a draft would be circulated for Community Representative views before finalisation.

David wished the group a merry Christmas and well wishes for the festive season.

The Chair thanked members for their participation and closed the meeting at 2:56pm EAST.

Correspondence received from a member of the community was not discussed during the meeting, but has been included as *Attachment E*.

Actions

4. Secretariat to organise an out of session catch-up with Community Representatives to discuss meeting logistics for 2026.
-

Attachment A

Open Action Items

No.	Meeting Date	Item	Requirement	Responsible Person	Completion Date	Status
1.1	18 May 2023	Route Growth Forecasts	AAB to work with Brisbane Airport Corporation (BAC) and Airservices on how to better provide information and data on expected aircraft movements, and previous and proposed impacts.	BAC Airservices Australia		Updated provided at meeting #10. Airservices published 2024 figures for information alongside Phase 6 Consultation. BAC has not yet published route growth forecast maps. Item to remain open until maps are published.
3.4	22 November 2023	Independent Assurance	Chair and Donna Marshall to discuss scope of works for Airservices' independent technical advisor for quality assurance. Airservices to task independent technical advisor, Think, to develop a research paper exploring the best metrics to understand noise reduction (in terms of sharing, concentration, and mitigation), and looking at the positives and negatives for each metric.	Chair Airservices Australia	Prior to next meeting	Update provided at meeting #10. Item to remain open until any feedback on the Think Paper circulated out of session is provided by community members.
3.8	22 November 2023	Noise Action Plan Metrics	Industry representatives to update the AAB on any progress to develop metrics under the Noise Action Plan for Brisbane. Airservices to task independent technical advisor, Think, to develop a research paper exploring the best metrics to understand noise reduction (in terms of sharing, concentration, and mitigation), and looking	Airservices Australia BAC	Prior to next meeting	Update provided at meeting #10. Item to remain open until any feedback on the Think Paper circulated out of session is provided by community members.

No.	Meeting Date	Item	Requirement	Responsible Person	Completion Date	Status
			at the positives and negatives for each metric.			
9.2	27 August 2025	NCIS complaint response examples	Janelle Moody to provide examples of complaint responses to the Secretariat for sharing with Airservices.	Janelle Moody	Prior to next meeting	Item discussed during meeting #10. To remain open until Janelle Moody provides examples of complaint responses to the Secretariat for sharing with Airservices.
10.1	19 November 2025	Questions arising from the Phase Six briefing – clarifying slides	Airservices Australia to send through correct slides with explanatory material from the Questions arising from the Phase Six briefing slide deck to the Secretariat for sharing with community representatives, and to confirm the basis of New Farm marker point included in the slide deck.	Airservices	Prior to next meeting	New Item.
10.2	19 November 2025	Revised KPI and outcomes data – framing questions	Airservices Australia to send through revised KPI and outcomes data with framing questions to seek targeted feedback from community representatives, to be circulated by the Secretariat.	Airservices Community Representatives	Prior to next meeting	New Item.
10.3	19 November 2025	<i>Noise Action Plan for Brisbane – Implementation Breakdown</i>	Airservices Australia to provide more detailed breakdown on implementation status and outcome for each of the actions under the <i>Noise Action Plan for Brisbane</i> .	Airservices	Prior to next meeting	New Item.
10.4	19 November 2025	Community Representative catch-up	Secretariat to organise an out of session catch-up with Community Representatives to discuss meeting logistics for 2026.	Secretariat	December 2025	New Item.

Closed Action Items

No.	Meeting Date	Item	Requirement	Responsible Person	Completion Date	Status
5.1	9 September 2024	Opportunities to reduce noise impacts from airline operations	Airline representatives to bring ideas about reducing noise impacts from their operations to the next AAB meeting.	Qantas Virgin	Ongoing	Closed. Airlines presented on fleet upgrades during meeting #10.
8.2	22 May 2025	Examine D'Aguilar National Park	Airservices to review potential use of area over D'Aguilar National Park and report back to the AAB.	Airservices	19 November 2025	Closed. Airservices presented findings of review during meeting #10.
9.1	27 August 2025	Noise metrics briefing	Airservices and Think Research to provide out of session briefing on noise metrics. The Secretariat will support with scheduling the session.	Airservices Secretariat	September 2025	Closed. Briefing session held out of session in September 2025.
9.3	27 August 2025	Revised KPI and outcomes data	Airservices to revise presented KPI and outcomes data presented based on the group's feedback, and circulate revised data and proposed approach to publishing the information out of session.	Airservices	November 2025	Closed. Circulated out of session in November 2025.
9.4	27 August 2025	Package Four queries	Airservices to advise whether Package Four is focussed on arrival routes, and if so why, and whether Package Four respite modes would be high capacity.	Airservices	19 November 2025	Closed. Airservices presented during meeting #10.
9.5	27 August 2025	Phase Six communications	Airservices to provide public communications around Phase Six consultation outcomes and next steps, including when a report would be available, when outcomes could be implemented, and further detail on Package Four.	Airservices	5 November 2025	Closed. Published on Noise Action Plan for Brisbane website on 5 November 2025. Discussed during meeting #10.

No.	Meeting Date	Item	Requirement	Responsible Person	Completion Date	Status
9.6	27 August 2025	Phase Six community feedback	Tess Bignell to provide further detail of community feedback on Phase Six consultation processes for Airservices' information.	Tess Bignell	November 2025	Closed. Tess provided further detail via the Secretariat, which was passed on to Airservices.
9.7	27 August 2025	Draft Master Plan media queries	BAC to provide breakdown of questions raised by journalist around the Master Plan at the next AAB meeting.	BAC	August 2025	Closed. Breakdown was circulated out of session following meeting #9.
9.8	27 August 2025	Tailwind safety case – public notice	BAC to provide notice when public information on tailwind safety case trial has been released.	BAC	19 November 2025	Closed. BAC advised when public information would be published during meeting #10.