

## Brisbane Airport Community Airspace Advisory Board (AAB)

# Meeting Minutes

DATE	LOCATION
18 March 2026	Brisbane Airport Conference Centre – Pullman Hotel
<b>MEETING TITLE: Brisbane Airport Community Airspace Advisory Board Meeting 11</b>	
<b>MEETING TIME: START TIME – 12:30      END TIME – 15:00</b>	

**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
Marion Lawie	Airservices Australia – Community Engagement Senior Advisor
Tim Boyle	Brisbane Airport Corporation – Head of Airspace Management
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**

- Luke Van Dongen – Virgin Australia – Fleet Manager
- 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.

---

## Agenda Item 2: Administration

---

The Chair introduced the meeting.

Matthew Loveday and Andrew Marshall attended the meeting virtually.

Apologies were received from Luke Van Dongen and Alex Tikoft.

### *Administration*

- Kim mentioned that a Community Representative had noted the minutes are turning into a transcript and reiterated that the purpose of the minutes is for the community to read clearly.
  - Kim reminded attendees that the meeting will be recorded.
  - Kim noted there is other business time at the end of 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).
  - The group discussed the item:
    - Kim explained that growth forecasting is managed by the airport through master planning, while Airservices focuses on flight planning maps and does not conduct growth forecasts. The airport typically reforecasts semi-regularly, with the current public forecast contained in the 2026 master plan.
    - A Community Representative raised concerns about assessing noise sharing and reduced concentration without forecasts.
    - Airservices provided an explanation that, unlike many countries where the airport manages all forecasting and environmental assessments, in Australia Airservices is responsible for noise and environmental assessment of flight path changes, and uses the most recent year of aircraft movements rather than forecasts.
    - Kim noted a gap in responsibility for ongoing aircraft noise forecasting, suggesting that advice from BAC and Airservices could help clarify roles. She suggested the AAB might like to consider making a recommendation on using forecasting rather than older data.
  - For **Action Items 3.4 / 3.8**, the items would remain open until the next meeting to allow time for community representatives to provide any further feedback on papers provided by Think Research.
  - The group discussed the item:
    - Community representatives and the Chair noted the community was still not satisfied with the metrics Airservices presented during AAB Meeting 9.
    - Airservices referred to their response to feedback from a Community Representative under **Action Item 10.2**, explaining that Airservices plan to produce a report once all elements of the *Noise Action Plan for Brisbane* have been fully defined and implemented. The report will compare
-

---

initial conditions, such as flight paths and noise concentration, including over-water concentration, with conditions after all actions have been completed.

- Airservices noted this analysis cannot be done until every action in the plan is fully implemented, making it a future deliverable. The intention is for the report to clearly show what the *Noise Action Plan for Brisbane* has achieved and provide useful information for the community.
- A Community Representative noted they had feedback they wished to provide in relation to **Action Item 10.2** regarding how KPIs might be more meaningful to community members in terms of their experience of noise and would do so via the Secretariat.
- Airservices thanked Community Representatives for feedback provided in relation to **Action Item 10.2**, and noted that feedback around whether the metrics shared to date were meaningful and useful would be valuable, and encouraged them to refer to the framing questions previously shared via the Secretariat to support consideration of proposed metrics.
- The Chair suggested Community Representatives could further consider metrics with the Chair, out of session.
- For **Action Item 9.2**, the Chair questioned whether Janelle Moody, would like to provide the complaint responses provided by the Noise Complaint and Information Service (NCIS) she had mentioned in Meeting 9.
  - Janelle described the manual effort required to match complaints with responses from NCIS, noting inconsistencies in formats and the lack of clear references to original complaints, which complicates the process for complainants.
  - Donna Marshall responded that she would contact the NCIS to confirm the most productive way to gather this information, and would further explore email responses that had been provided from the NCIS.
  - Community Representatives expressed dissatisfaction with the generic nature of recent NCIS responses, which often do not address the specifics of complaints or provide detailed explanations, leading to frustration and a sense of disconnect between the process and community needs.
  - Airservices also noted that the Aircraft Noise Ombudsman (ANO) was available in the event members of the public were dissatisfied with how the NCIS had handled their complaint.
  - The group further discussed the quality of responses from the NCIS, with Airservices acknowledging that the quality of responses appeared to not be meeting their expectations.
  - The group discussed the importance of being able to track complaints and responses easily, suggesting improvements such as searchable complaint numbers, narrative explanations, a more empathetic and chatty tone to responses, and more transparent processes to enhance user experience and satisfaction.
  - A Community Representative observed that one pilot in a sequence of flights had done ‘the right thing’ as that plane had been quieter than the others in the sequence. David McCutcheon noted that it’s not about a pilot doing something right or wrong as there were many technical reasons why a specific flight may be noisier than others, relating to sequencing, speed, height, weight, and fuel consumption.
  - The Chair noted it would be useful to have a factsheet or similar explanatory material that explained these sorts of points, and that this could be useful to discuss further out of session.
  - David noted the UK Civil Aviation Authority had a factsheet which set out this information, as did Washington Airport in the United States.
  - The group agreed the item could be closed, with Airservices to undertake further exploration of approaches to improving complaint responses as a new action item from this meeting.

#### Potential use of Artificial Intelligence (AI)

- With the caveat that this had not been tested more widely in the organisation for views, Jacqui O’Dea suggested there could be value in exploring the use of AI to provide faster, more precise, and

---

tailored responses to complaints, while maintaining human oversight to ensure accuracy and appropriateness, and cited international examples of automated response systems.

- The group discussed, and broadly agreed that this could be helpful, as long as:
  - the source data is contained and correct; and
  - responses still had a human element (and some empathy)
- Tim Boyle noted that Schiphol Airport in the Netherlands already had an AI-based noise information tool, with approximately 26,000 queries and complaints being replied to automatically every month, and only 5 per cent having further escalation for personal investigation and response.
- Airservices noted the ANO held strong views on the need for a human element and personalising responses.
- Airservices also briefly noted that NCIS staff are expected to compose their responses formally, to demonstrate the seriousness of the matters raised in community queries and complaints, and that this may at times come across as lacking warmth.
- For **Action Item 10.4**, the Chair confirmed the session had been held in December 2025, and the item could be closed.

#### **Actions**

1. Chair and Community Representatives to meet out of session before the end of April 2026 to discuss potential submission in relation to Fly Considerately Guidance, community metrics and KPIs, and factsheets and material on airplane performance and noise.

---

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

The Chair noted that some issues raised prior to the meeting are not on the Agenda because responses had been provided out of session. There is the opportunity to discuss any follow-up queries during *Agenda Item 7*, or out of session.

#### ***Consultation Paper – Flying Considerately Guidance***

The Chair introduced the item, noting:

- DITRDSCA (the department) has been running a consultation process on developing Flying Considerately Guidance (included as *Attachment B*),
- The Chair contacted the relevant section of the department expressing disappointment that the consultation period was so short; and that community aviation bodies such as AAB and CACGs were not advised of it.
- While formal submissions closed on 3 March 2026, the Chair had secured an extension, should the AAB be interested in providing a submission.
- The Melbourne Community Aviation Consultation Group (CACG) provided a submission which has been distributed to the AAB Community Representatives for information.

The Chair welcomed any views from industry and government representatives which could inform a submission. The group discussed the item:

- Airservices clarified that the NCIS can investigate complaints outside controlled airports and provided an example of a successful intervention at Cambridge Aerodrome (in Hobart, Tasmania), while noting that the guidance is more relevant to uncontrolled airspace and smaller airports.
  - Tim noted that pilots are generally adhering to published procedures at major airports, such as Brisbane Airport.
  - A Community Representative queried BAC on how the interaction between the airports work, particularly when aircraft such as helicopters appear to be coming from Archerfield before the new runway opens.
  - Airservices noted that it was more an Airport Traffic Control matter, rather than an airport matter.
-

- 
- Airservices noted that some operators have activities they need to conduct that are not compatible with normal passenger transport operations because there simply is not enough airspace availability during regular operating hours. As a result, they make use of the early-morning period, when the airport is not yet open for regular passenger services, to complete tasks such as aerial photography, surveying, or other specialised work. They are taking advantage of the low-traffic window to safely and efficiently carry out this type of business.
  - A Community Representative raised concerns about the combined effects of commercial and general aviation flights over residential areas, alongside regular passenger transport flights, highlighting instances where multiple aircraft from different sources contribute to noise and community concerns.
  - Further, the community representative acknowledged that the 'flying considerably' guidance cannot mandate equipment like ADSB for all aircraft and that effectiveness of the guidance is limited in controlled airspace, suggesting that further discussion is needed to formulate a group response.
  - A Community Representative suggested that, within the context of the *Noise Action Plan for Brisbane* and areas identified for reduced concentration, "flying neighbourly" could be defined as avoiding those concentrated areas wherever possible, and recommended that this be formally considered.
  - The Chair noted that the point made did not directly relate to the current discussion about "flying considerably," except in how the concepts interact. To achieve what is being suggested would likely require a broader "flying neighbourly" agreement that involves all airports. The Chair noted there would be uncertainty about how such an agreement would function, given that it would need to be applied consistently at a national level.
  - Sarah Nattey noted that Archerfield and Brisbane operate in very close proximity, as do Melbourne and Essendon in Victoria, and Perth with Jandakot in Western Australia. While each location has its own specific challenges, they share the common issue of managing interactions between major airports traffic and nearby general, particularly regarding the crossover of flight paths.
  - The group agreed that the Chair and Community Representatives would have an out of session discussion to settle an approach to making a submission on the guidance material.

***Stephen Muller – Departures to the south during north winds***

Stephen Muller presented the paper, included as *Attachment C*.

Stephen noted that:

- Following the Ministerial Direction, Airservices introduced a new southbound flight path in November 2024 to support increased utilisation of SODPROPS.
- Bayside community members had felt that the new flight paths would substantially reduce aircraft noise over communities, but that regular examples of 'short-cutting' and what is seen by communities as divergence from the Standard Instrument Departure (SID) route was reducing the effectiveness of noise-mitigation measures and increasing aircraft noise over residential areas (particularly in the period from October 2025 to January 2026).
- Ongoing issues with the performance of WebTrak was also hampering Stephen's ability to look at examples of short-cutting raised by community members.
- It was not all flights that were 'cutting the corner' over communities, but perhaps 40 per cent of flights appears to be doing so, and these flights were also generally lower when passing back over coastal communities.
- Noise impacts from these flights meant that community members felt that SODPROPS wasn't achieving its purported intent of reducing flights over communities by maximising flights over water.
- Divergence from SIDs were often identified as being the result of weather or conflicts, or had been made at the request of pilots.

The group discussed the item:

- Airservices noted that it had provided explanations for SID non-adherence before, and that it was looking at design issues which meant that some flights could not achieve the turn set out in the SID.

- 
- Airservices noted that some of the examples raised were also a matter of sequencing aircraft with different performance capabilities, and moving slower aircraft off the SID earlier to avoid spacing issues.
  - Airservices reminded the group that as a result of questions raised around SID adherence in previous meetings, they had changed processes and issued new operational instructions to Air Traffic Control to keep aircraft on the SID up to 20,000 feet to reduce noise impacts, and no longer provided non-SID departure options unless 'required' by the pilot of the relevant aircraft.
  - Community Representatives discussed challenges in monitoring compliance, including limitations with tools like WebTrak, inconsistent reporting approaches, and the need for more transparent and accessible compliance data.
  - David questioned the definition of 'compliance' and Airservices noted that they are not regulators and that they monitor and report on 'adherence' not 'compliance'.
  - Airservices noted that it could consolidate and reshare responses to the Secretariat, but in general:
    - The short route was not the result of an unofficial flight path, but an alternative departure when a compass heading is used;
    - Compass headings are processed in line with a SID but cannot be followed as closely as the procedural SIDs which are programmed into the aircraft.
  - A Community Representative requested more direct engagement opportunities, such as site visits or access to real-time ATC operations to better understand non-adherence.
  - Airservices noted practical limitations to providing this level of access, but agreed that it could continue keep looking at the issues Stephen had raised (noting it was tracking adherence with the SID, and was looking at changing the SID to address performance issues).
  - The Chair noted that members of the public, and the community representatives could not reasonably second guess the decisions of expert pilots and ATC on matters of safety.
  - Airservices noted that it held an Executive meeting every week where tracking departures were reviewed, but that Air Traffic Control needed to have the flexibility to move flights around where required for safety or sequencing reasons.
  - A Community Representative noted that non-adherence and variation in tracking was a perhaps a welcome form of 'de-concentration'.
  - A Community Representative emphasised that he did not agree with this position, noting it did not take the height of flights coming back over land into consideration.
  - Airservices noted that it needed to find a better way to show the SIDs and that there would be some level of variation around the SID path, and once again welcomed Community Representatives' feedback on ways to report on SID-adherence as per previous discussions.

## **Actions**

2. Airservices to consider and respond to matters raised by Stephen Muller, including consolidation of previous advice and responses.

---

## **Agenda Item 5: Airservices update**

*Note: Following discussion in Agenda Item 4, the group moved on to Agenda Item 6, before returning to Agenda Item 5, noting time limitations. Ordering according to the agenda has been maintained for the purposes of the minutes.*

Donna Marshall provided the presentation included as *Attachment D*.

### **Airservices action items**

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

- For **Action item 3.4/3.8**, Airservices noted that the actions had been discussed during *Agenda Item 3*, and would be discussed further by the Chair and community representatives out of session.
-

- 
- For **Action 9.2**, Airservices noted that the action had been discussed during *Agenda Item 3*, and could be closed, noting Airservices would further explore as a new Action Item.
  - For **Action Item 10.1**, the item was complete and could be closed.
  - For **Action Item 10.2**, the item had been completed, noting some community representatives would provide input, as discussed during *Agenda Item 3*.
  - For **Action Item 10.3**, Airservices would discuss the item during the presentation, with the item considered complete following this discussion.

#### **Action Item 10.3 – Noise Action Plan for Brisbane – Implementation Breakdown**

Airservices presented the draft *Noise Action Plan for Brisbane* action status summary which had been circulated alongside agenda papers for the purposes of **Action Item 10.3**.

The group discussed the item:

- Airservices spoke to the slide, explaining a detailed breakdown of actions completed, under assessment, or dismissed across multiple packages of the *Noise Action Plan for Brisbane*, and sought feedback from the group on the presentation of actions.
- Kim suggested there could be value in altering the document presentation so the status of each item is clearer and shown first. However, Kim acknowledged that the current order reflects structure of actions in the *Noise Action Plan for Brisbane* which may be easier to follow.
- A Community Representative expressed dissatisfaction with the Airservices website, noting it is difficult to use, and that while the summary provided for the purpose of **Action Item 10.3** was a good summary, the outcomes associated with the actions were still not clear.
- Airservices noted that they are currently updating their website and are in an active tender process, expected to be finalised by August this year. Implementation work will follow, which will take some time. The Airservices Engage page (which is used for the *Noise Action Plan for Brisbane*) – where these reports are hosted – will remain unchanged, but the content on the Aircraft in Your Neighbourhood website will be reviewed. The representative acknowledged that there is significant work ahead and confirmed that Airservices recognises the need to improve the website.
- Community representatives discussed the need for clearer links between each overarching action, and the specific detail and outcomes underlying each action, including reference pathways and / or hyperlinks showing how actions and outcomes map back to relevant engagement documentation (for example, where there are multiple options being consulted on under specific Package Three options).
- Airservices suggested a single link or column could connect each item (e.g. Action 3.1B with its multiple options) to the next level of detail, with all supporting documents grouped under the executive summary.
- Airservices agreed that it would further consider how the status for each action could be linked to the most relevant engagement or outcome for the action.
- Airservices explained that the final report for the Noise Action Plan for Brisbane would document each of the 82 actions, outlining what was examined, what was done, and the resulting outcome for each item.
- A Community Representative emphasised that the community should also have a view on if the action has been achieved.
- Airservices noted that it undertook public consultation on the reporting of completed actions, with a four-week community comment period allowing feedback or disagreement on outcomes and decisions.

#### Brisbane Baseline Model

- Community representatives raised concerns about the Brisbane Baseline Model and queried when 2025 data would be available in the model.
  - Airservices explained that while tools like the Brisbane Baseline Model may not meet every individual expectation, it does fulfil its intent of showing current operations for comparison.
  - Airservices noted that delays in 2025 data being made available are due to the large volume and multiple data sources involved.
-

---

Airservices then presented a summary of *Noise Action Plan for Brisbane* actions broken down by geographic area, intended to demonstrate which actions would be likely to impact which communities:

- A Community Representative noted that this information has been very helpful and would benefit the community.
- A Community Representative noted 'under assessment' is very broad term and further explanation is needed.
- Airservices noted that these geographic summaries could similarly include links for each action to the most relevant engagement activity or outcome to improve clarity and navigation.
- Airservices noted that it would further consider how the breakdown summaries could be finalised.

***Update on Noise Action Plan (Package 3/Package 4) and 2026 work plan***

Airservices continued to present, speaking to their 2026 work plan and providing an update on Package 3 and Package 4. Airservices noted that:

- It was aiming to announce Package 3 outcomes in June 2026 and would give detail of implementation timeframes as part of this announcement.
- Design of Package 4 consultation and initial concepts would be progressed in the latter half of 2026.

The group discussed the item:

- A Community Representative questioned if the AAB would be briefed on Package 3 outcomes at the next AAB meeting.
  - Airservices noted that Package 3 outcomes may not be fully settled in time for the next meeting (scheduled for 18 June 2026), but that Airservices may be able to provide some information and could offer an out of session briefing to community members if timing necessitated.
  - A Community Representative asked how long Trax will remain engaged.
  - Airservices advised that Trax will continue their involvement until all actions in Packages 3 and 4 are completed, which is the same arrangement in place for Think Research.
  - A Community Representative asked for an update on Package 4 on multiple departure paths.
  - Airservices confirmed they consulted Trax, who are considering the proposal:
    - Trax is assessing options for compass operations, including designing separate departure paths from each runway end to enable flexible use and facilitate community respite periods.
    - Trax is exploring whether multiple, distinct departure paths (rather than shared initial tracks) can be created for different runway ends.
    - Separately, Trax is considering whether multiple departure paths could be used for RPN-AR departures, but this may be more complex, and that Trax was looking at what was being done internationally, whether the uses were tested, and if aircraft could actually perform the SID.
  - David noted that in specific circumstances, exemptions from endorsed ICAO departure procedures can be used, but they are customised, subject to specific provisions, and rarely used, noting the procedures were only used in areas where landscape necessitate it, such as Queenstown (New Zealand), and a small alpine airport in North America.
  - Airservices noted that while use of alternate departures may be feasible for compass respite operations, it was unlikely to be feasible for typical modes of operation.
  - A Community Representative queried whether Airservices was likely to achieve positive outcomes, particularly community respite, when looking at multiple departure paths for the compass-based respite modes.
  - Airservices responded that:
    - Trax had highlighted how airports such as Heathrow use multiple departure paths in different directions to provide flexibility and respite.
    - Trax noted that current compass operations result in aircraft using the same paths consistently.
-

- 
- Trax advised that designing flight paths connecting to all four runway ends could allow Airservices to rotate use and provide periods of respite for affected communities.

### **Feedback on Airservices Board engagement**

Jacqui O’Dea provided an update to the group on engagement with the Airservices Board on Brisbane Airport noise matters:

- Airservices has two engagement and assurance programs (relating to aircraft noise, and PFAS) which are regularly reported to the Airservices Board, and discussed in Executive-level meetings.
- The Board receives detailed updates on all airports with active engagement programs, including noise issues and PFAS remediation, with Brisbane discussed at every meeting.
- The Board and Executive team are closely monitoring progress and timelines for the *Noise Action Plan for Brisbane* and are eager for the work to be finalised to provide community certainty.
- The Board also regularly considers reports which include detailed noise-complaints data, and the Aircraft Noise Ombudsman attends every second meeting to discuss complaint trends and Airservices’ responsiveness.

### **Actions**

3. Airservices to further consider best approach to linking between actions for the summary of *Noise Action Plan* for Brisbane implementation status update, and report back to the group.

---

### **Agenda Item 6: Brisbane Airport Corporation update**

*Note: Following discussion in Agenda Item 4, the group moved on to Agenda Item 6, before returning to Agenda Item 5, noting time limitations. Ordering according to the agenda has been maintained for the purposes of the minutes.*

Tim Boyle provided the presentation included as *Attachment E*.

### **Tailwind Safety Case update**

Tim provided an update on the tailwind trial, noting that:

- Cathay Pacific and Qantas freight most frequently utilised tailwind operations during nighttime hours.
- Weather conditions, particularly northerly winds and rain, have resulted in reduced opportunities to trial the voluntary tailwind procedure.
- The trial was otherwise running as expected.
- Voluntary tailwind operations were generally not available between 10:00pm–11:15pm due to traffic complexity, with similar constraints between 5:00–6:00am, potentially impacted by daylight saving.
- Route and destination significantly influence whether tailwinds are likely to be opted for.
- Departures with tailwinds of up to 8 knots have been observed, with no higher values recorded.
- Airline data has not identified any performance or safety concerns.

The group discussed the update:

- Community representatives queried why Jetstar and Qantas passenger flights did not appear to be participating in the trial.
  - A Community Representative noted they understood Qantas had issued a directive to pilots to not participate in the trial.
  - David noted there aren’t any relevant Qantas or Jetstar flights in operation during the nighttime trial hours (from 11:00 PM to 5:00 AM), other than a Qantas departure to Los Angeles, which would not meet the performance requirements necessary for the procedure.
-

- 
- Discussion noted differences between aircraft types and routes, with long-haul flights carrying heavier loads and additional crew compared to shorter routes, meaning the voluntary tailwind procedure could not be achieved.
  - It was also noted that some international services (e.g. Boeing 777 operations) have recently operated with lower load factors, meaning lighter aircraft.
  - A Community Representative queried participation rates, noting approximately 10 per cent of flights appear to be taking up the option to use the tail wind procedure.
  - BAC explained that participation is determined by individual flight crews (captain discretion) rather than airlines as a whole and therefore cannot be accurately broken down by airline.

### ***Brisbane Airport Community Aviation Consultative Group***

Tim provided an update on changes to the Brisbane Airport Community Aviation Consultation Group (BACACG) following finalisation of the new CACG Guidelines:

- The electorate-based structure and quarterly meetings will continue.
- Additional representatives will be sought, including tourism, local airport-based businesses, active transport, and potentially representatives for accessibility and First Nations communities.
- Improvements will be made to transparency, including earlier publication of agenda items.
- Meeting structure will be revised to allow for a broader range of topics.
- Turnaround times for meeting minutes will be improved.
- An annual report will be introduced to capture key agenda items and actions.

### ***SODPROPS Outlook***

Tim provided an update on some analysis which had been undertaken by BAC on SODPROPS utilisation:

- The original EIS for the western runway indicated that daytime SODPROPS would likely become unavailable beyond 2035.
- The EIS forecast predicted that daytime SODPROPS would become unavailable at approximately 400,000 annual aircraft movements.
- However, forecasts developed for the 2026 draft Master Plan show that this traffic level is unlikely to be reached until well into the 2040s.
- Based on these forecasts, daytime SODPROPS is therefore highly likely to remain achievable beyond 2035 during lower-traffic periods.
- Night-time SODPROPS operations are expected to remain viable for the foreseeable future.

### ***2026 work plan (and other updates)***

Tim provided an update on other activities for 2026:

- The draft Master Plan 2026 has been submitted to the Minister for consideration, and BAC is currently responding to a request for specified material pursuant to section 80A of the *Airports Act 1996*.
- A runway works program is planned for August–October 2026, which will impact both runways.
- Once planning and scheduling are finalised, Brisbane Airport will begin public engagement to inform the community about the upcoming works.
- A community member asked whether Airservices' Early Turn Trial would be delayed due to the planned runway works now being expected to be undertaken from August–October 2026 (rather than June 2026 as originally estimated).
- Airservices advised that the timing of the trial is undecided, with further assessment of feasibility required – delay of the works gives more time for this assessment and consideration. A community update is expected to be released in the coming months.

---

*Note: the group then returned to discuss Agenda Item 5.*

---

### **Agenda Item 7: Airservices – discussion of out of session items**

---

*Note: Give time constraints, this item was not discussed during the meeting. The geographic breakdown of Noise Action Plan for Brisbane actions by geographic area were discussed during Agenda Item 5, as a complement to the breakdown provided for the **Action Item 10.3**.*

---

### **Agenda Item 8: Other Business**

---

The Chair provided an update on the expression of interest (EOI) process being undertaken to identify a new Community Representatives for the AAB, noting that:

- Eight EOIs had been received and assessed against the selection criteria, alongside consideration of relevant skills and experience, and the diversity of the AAB's makeup.
- The Chair had finalised the assessment and was consulting with the Minister prior to making an appointment (with feedback from the Minister pending).
- Applicants who were not interviewed have been notified they were unsuccessful.
- Once the new Community Representative is appointed, they will be briefed and introduced to the group before attending their first meeting.
- Kim suggested that, as part of the operational review of the AAB and input into potential revisions to the Terms of Reference, consideration could be given to adding an additional community member to broaden representation across more geographic areas.
- Kim thanked members for their participation and closed the meeting at 3:12PM.

The next meeting is scheduled for 18 June 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	When possible	Updated provided at meeting #11. 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 #11. 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 at the positives and negatives for each metric.	Airservices Australia BAC	Prior to next meeting	Update provided at meeting #11. Item to remain open until any feedback on the Think Paper circulated out of session is provided by community members.

OFFICIAL

No.	Meeting Date	Item	Requirement	Responsible Person	Completion Date	Status
11.1	18 March 2026	Out-of-session meeting	Chair and Community Representatives to meet out of session before the end of April 2026 to discuss potential submission in relation to Fly Considerately Guidance, community metrics and KPIs, and factsheets and material on airplane performance and noise.	Chair Community Representatives	Before end of April 2026	New item.  Meeting held in week of 23 March 2026.
11.2	18 March 2026	NCIS complaint processes	Airservices to undertake further exploration of approaches to improving complaint responses.	Airservices	Prior to next meeting	New item.
11.3	18 March 2026	Departures to the south during north winds	Airservices to consider and respond to matters raised by Stephen Muller, including consolidation of previous advice and responses.	Airservices	Prior to next meeting	New item.
11.4	18 March 2026	Noise Action Plan for Brisbane – Implementation breakdown and linkages	Airservices to further consider best approach to linking between actions for the summary of <i>Noise Action Plan for Brisbane</i> implementation status update, and report back to the group.	Airservices	Prior to next meeting	New item.

## Closed Action Items

No.	Meeting Date	Item	Requirement	Responsible Person	Completion Date	Status
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 #11. Item closed.  Airservices will further consider and follow up with NCIS out of session under <b>Action Item 11.2.</b>
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	Response from Airservices circulated on 12 December 2025. Item closed.
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	Item discussed during meeting #11. Item closed.
10.3	19 November 2025	Noise Action Plan for Brisbane – Implementation Breakdown	Airservices Australia to provide more detailed breakdown on implementation status and outcome for each of the actions under the Noise Action Plan for Brisbane.	Airservices	Prior to next meeting	Item discussed during meeting #11. Item closed.
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	Meeting held in December 2025. Item closed.