

## **BAC Growth Forecast and Noise Action Plan Targets – Agenda Item**

As the AAB members would be aware, I have been actively seeking from the Industry the latest Brisbane Airport growth forecasts to enable an understanding of the adequacy, challenges and progress, of the Noise Action Plan for Brisbane (**NAPB**). The plan that this Committee has oversight responsibility.

At the last AAB meeting, BAC provided the latest aircraft movement forecasts (out to 2040) showing a doubling of annual aircraft movements and peak hourly movements increasing by 45%. Needless to say, this is extremely concerning to all of us in the community that are already experiencing significant noise pollution impacts. There are also serious health and environmental (including tank water quality) concerns that remain either unanswered or not acknowledged by the aviation industry and its key stakeholders. In presenting the forecasts, Mr Boyle (BAC) highlighted that the forecast volumes are consistent with the Brisbane Airport Master Plan. He also advised that there is no execution management plan regarding the noise, social and environmental impacts on the community. However, he did add that BAC is committed to meeting growth in demand for aviation services with appropriate noise abatement procedures in place.

At the AAB meeting, I enquired as to how Brisbane Airport could expect to meet this growth while having sufficient noise abatement procedures in place given the past and present community experience. I also expressed serious concern that the community has already experienced growth in aviation activity with absolutely no improvements to noise mitigation. This remains a serious question that I do not believe can go unanswered by the AAB. Since the meeting, I have endeavoured to understand what the approved NAPB will actually deliver to residents in quantitative terms. Or simply put, what percentage of noise reduction will the community experience over the next 17 years to compensate for the doubling of aircraft flights and presumably a similar doubling of noise and other adverse community impacts.

Unfortunately, despite me being actively involved with the noise issues since the NPR opened and now being an appointed community member, I genuinely have no idea in terms of quantitative noise improvement what the NAPB is seeking to deliver or what is possible to be delivered. For example, is it 5% or 55% reduction of the total expected noise? In the absence any quantifiable improvement targets, are we expecting that the community will experience a doubling of the noise as the years roll by? In the last couple of weeks, BAC has made public commentary on some ad hoc system 'improvements' that potentially could see more international flights operating over the water and some of the A320 noise buckets having retrofits that may result in noise reduction. All the media outlets have ran with the 'positive' headlines but, as has been the case over the past 18 years of the NPR project/operations, no factual quantification of the reported noise improvements were provided or committed to; just a media headline that provided BAC with a quick PR 'hit' but did little to reassure the community of the validity or extent of any noise abatement outcomes.

Personally, after working for over forty years on multi-million dollar operations and projects, I have never been party to an improvement program where the actual plan lacks any targets or quantification of improvement options and outcomes. As we all know you can't improve what you can't measure. As a community representative, I field many requests where the community desperately want noise improvement and a large number had hoped that the new NAPB and the AAB would deliver real noise improvement. Unfortunately, I have no facts to provide any assurance that noise improvement is on the way or the extent of any improvement.

Another section of the community are more sceptical, arguing that the NAPB & AAB are just 'Engagement Theatre'; a ploy to kick the issues down the path and further frustrate the community

into submission. The community do have every right to be sceptical, and whilst the master plan may be intact, certainly it is at odds with what the community has been lead to believe by the industry. Issues such as below provide valid concern within our community as to ongoing Engagement Theatre.

Pre NPR Opening ;

- A massive and misleading PR story of SODPROPS as preferred operating mode with headlines that 90% over the bay was a realistic target (reality is its less than 4% and dropping)
- A NPR super highway flightpath design with a concentrated noise corridor for inward and outward flights that was dropped onto the community last minute and without any consultation
- Flightpaths that have been crammed in alongside pre-existing flightpath creating inefficient performance and unnecessary complexity
- Total suburbs such as New Farm, Brookfield and Samford (to name a few) that were consistently advised that the new NPR would have no impact for their communities and lifestyles
- Areas such as Hawthorne to have 40 to 60 flights – reality more likely 150 to 200 by 2023 (let alone what it will be in 2040)

And more recently we are seeing:

- Government and industry gaslighting of the community if they dare to complain or challenge the noise and other social concerns
- Trials that have been poorly designed and delivered either zero or immaterial improvement
- National carriers operating noisy aircraft where the rest of the developed world have modified their fleets years ago and many airports have strict penalties for noisy aircraft
- Three years of NPR operation without one material flight noise reduction initiative being logged as public record.

As an informed community member, I find it totally unacceptable that master plans can be developed that totally ignore the operating practices required to protect communities. My personal observations of the NPR feasibility and implementation plans quality and processes relating to Social and Environment management as compared to other major industries is one of extremely poor practice. The last three years has also identified that Australian (Brisbane) aviation is well behind world's best practice in flight path design and operation as they relate to social responsibility and governance.

In closing, I fail to understand how the AAB can continue to support a NAPB where there are no measurable targets or even rough estimates as to what will be achieved. The idea of an improvement programme without any targets defies belief. Another concern is that we have no common language in regard to noise 'improvement' and/or 'reduction'. I am concerned that some AAB members may view noise improvement as simply moving the noise from one community to another. We have precise volumes of aircraft movements and one can only assume based on past experience at Brisbane and, in the absence of firm improvement targets, that the increases in flights will directly correlate to the same percentage increase in noise and other social and environmental concerns. This outcome is totally unacceptable.

I stand to be corrected or educated if I have the above wrong. However, I believe most community members and possibly AAB Committee members have absolutely no idea what relief the NAPB will deliver.

**Recommendations:**

- 1. An immediate attempt is made to develop quantifiable targets for the various NAPB recommendations**
- 2. Definitions of noise 'reduction' and 'improvement' are established**
- 3. For any future noise/flight information issued for media consumption by AAB industry or government sources the subject information must be accompanied with transparent quantifiable data as to the extent of noise improvement as compared to total forecast noise/flight levels.**