

Brisbane Airport Community Airspace Advisory Board (AAB)—community representative out of session questions and answers

31 August 2026

This document records questions raised by AAB community representatives between meetings, which are therefore not included in meeting minutes. Answers are provided by industry and government. The document includes questions since November 2024. This version is current as of 31 August 2026. New content will be highlighted with each updated version.

Table of contents

Noise Action Plan for Brisbane	3
Noise Action Plan for Brisbane — Community Engagement and Consultation	3
Noise Action Plan for Brisbane — Governance and Implementation	5
Flight Path Design	7
Flight Path Design — Legacy runway changes	7
Flight Path Design — Modes of operation	8
Flight Path Design — Package Three (preferred options)	9
Flight Path Design — Package Three — Departure routes over land	11
Flight Path Design — Package Three — Movement of RNP-AR Join Point	11
Flight Path Design — Package Four	12
Flight Path Design — Southern Approach	13
Land Use Planning and Development	14
Master Plan and Major Development Plan processes	14
Noise Complaints	16
Noise Complaints and Information Service	16
Public Information and Reporting	17
Public Information and Reporting — Relationship between potential lowering of cloud ceiling and tailwind trial	17
Public Information and Reporting — Accuracy and availability	19
Public Information and Reporting — Airservices Baseline Model	21
Public Information and Reporting — New airline services	22
Public Information and Reporting — Noise monitoring	23

Public Information and Reporting – Operating mode	25
Public Information and Reporting – Route growth forecasts.....	26
Public Information and Reporting – Significant events notifications	27
Public Information and Reporting – Tailwind trial.....	28
Technical Operations	29
Technical Operations – Airservices Staffing	29
Technical Operations – Divergence from Standard Instrument Departures (SIDs)	29
Technical Operations – Legacy Runway	31
Technical Operations – Northerly Arrivals.....	32
Technical Operations – Operating Restrictions	33
Technical Operations – Systems Upgrades.....	35
Technical Operations – Use of RPN-AR (Required Navigation Performance – Authorisation Required).....	35
Technical Operations – Use of Segregated mode	37

Noise Action Plan for Brisbane

Noise Action Plan for Brisbane — Community Engagement and Consultation

Period	Question	Answer
Before AAB Meeting 6 (20 November 2024)	Community Engagement Standard – In September 2023, Airservices Australia implemented a new community engagement standard. Stakeholders of other airports seem to be receiving much more detailed information than Brisbane residents. 1. Is the standard being applied to Brisbane Airport engagement? 2. Where can we find the Community Engagement Plan for the Brisbane Airport changes? 3. Why does Engage show that other airports receive Community Engagement Plans (for example Gladstone, from October 2024) but Brisbane does not?	1. Airservices Australia (Airservices): The Community Engagement Standard does not apply to programs that were already in progress ahead of its introduction. The Noise Action Plan Communications Approach was finalised in August 2023 after engagement with the Brisbane community. It contains some of the principles and processes reflected in the CES which was in draft at the time, but it was developed as the bespoke engagement commitment for the Noise Action Plan based on what the community said they expected. 2. Airservices: On the Noise Action Plan for Brisbane Engage Airservices page here, noting this is only for Noise Action Plan for Brisbane engagement, not any other changes associated with Brisbane Airport. 3. Airservices: The Communications Approach for the Noise Action Plan for Brisbane is this plan and is in the list of documents on the right side of the Engage project page.
Before AAB Meeting 7 (26 February 2025)	In relation to the recent release of the NAP4B Quarterly Update dated 10 January 2025. Feedback from the community thus far is that the timing of the report is confusing given that Airservices and TRAX have been out to the Community since these Phases of Engagement. I note that Phase Three and Four Reports have provided an Option for Feedback on the Reports, but Phase One Report, does not. Can you please provide some feedback as to why this decision was made?	Airservices: The Phase One Options Assessment Report was released on 17 November 2023 for a four week public review and comment period. The version we recently released is the updated final report that has considered the feedback received. We acknowledge the lag in reporting against the actual engagement phase timing. The Noise Action Plan for Brisbane is an extremely large program of work, and we have to prioritise all of the activity it requires. While we conduct the assessment of feedback on options immediately after engaging communities so we can keep design and assessment activity moving in the background, the compilation of public-facing reports on this has been delayed while we focus on developing new options or preferred designs that aim to improve noise outcomes for communities. We are hoping with this older reporting now caught up, that we can stay a little closer on our reporting to the actual engagement timing.

Period	Question	Answer
Before AAB Meeting 8 (22 May 2025)	After reviewing the Airservices NAP4B Website there is continued confusion around Packages and Phases. The NAP4B was designed and split into Four Packages. The advice on the website is not clearly understood. Engagement Timing Update dated the 28 Feb 2025 mentions Package Three with an expected release date “to be advised”. The Timeline Schedule does not mention Package Three at all, just Phases apart from the last on the list where it says Package Four. Can Airservices advise why Package Three is not mentioned on the Timeline Schedule? Previously this showed Package Three with a delivery timing in the first quarter of 2025. The night time operations which originally formed part of Package Two, July 2023 failed to proceed and was pushed to form part of Package Three. Airservices promised night time operations was a priority delivery for the NAP4B. We are all tired and frustrated and my community has been waiting patiently for what will now be nearly five years for some answers and options.	Airservices: To clarify, the term Package is a reference to the Noise Action Plan for Brisbane key areas of focus for improvements and the term Phase is a reference to the round of engagement conducted or planned. The actions comprising the four packages of work are being delivered across multiple phases of engagement, with actions from different packages often addressed within each phase. This allowed us to prioritise changes from each Package that could be implemented sooner and to group changes focused on similar locations or operations. We have developed a visual overview that maps actions from different packages to each phase of engagement; this can be downloaded as a PNG from the list of documents on the right side of the Engage project page. We commenced engagement with a focus on Package One and Two. At that time, we did not know how many phases of engagement these actions might require and we had a mix of both Package actions spread across various phases. We had not yet commenced engagement planning for Package 3 or 4 and so listed the anticipated timeframe for their commencement without reference to any particular phase number. We are now engaging on Package Three actions and those transferred from Package Two into this body of work. Package Four remains a future engagement activity and is still presented as a future anticipated timing. Over-water departures at night have been implemented and the trial of over land non-jet departures before 6am has also been implemented. The night-time operations progressed from Package Two (Phase Three engagement) were moved to Package Three to ensure any designs developed considered these options and did not develop contradictory designs. The next phase of engagement (Phase Six) will provide the outcomes of the further investigation of these actions. As discussed at the AAB meeting of 26 February 2025, we have been unable to commit to a date for Phase Seven due to the federal government election caretaker period requirements which apply to all federal government agencies. We are awaiting the conclusion of this period, after which we will announce the timing.

Noise Action Plan for Brisbane — Governance and Implementation

Period	Question	Answer
Before AAB Meeting 6 (20 November 2024)	Noise Action Plan for Brisbane: The AAB terms of reference provide that: The Noise Action Plan for Brisbane will be a living document to be maintained by Brisbane Airport Corporation (BAC) and Airservices. - When was this plan last updated, and where can the 'living document' be found? - What are the governance procedures around changes to the Noise Action Plan and is there a document that tracks these changes for ease of reference? - Is there a scorecard that shows progress on the action items i.e. what is complete, when completed, target dates etc.	Airservices: There have been no updates, as we have not found any additional actions that need to be added to it at this stage. Airservices: Any changes to the Noise Action Plan for Brisbane would be subject to community engagement and approval through the Noise Action Plan for Brisbane Program Management Office and then the department who maintain an oversight role per recommendation 1.1aa of the Noise Action Plan for Brisbane. Airservices: We have not produced a scorecard. Quarterly progress updates are shared with the community on the Engage Airservices page (Engage Airservices).
Before AAB Meeting 6 (20 November 2024)	Implementation of the recommendations identified in the PIR – The terms of reference of the AAB provide that one of the purposes of the AAB is: to provide advice to and from the community on the recommendations identified in the Post Implementation Review. - Where does the community find updates on the status of the implementation process? - Is there a scorecard that shows progress on the action items i.e. what is complete, when completed, target dates etc.	Note: Recommendations from the Post Implementation Review are being implemented through the Noise Action Plan for Brisbane. Airservices: Quarterly progress updates are shared with the community on the Engage Airservices page. Airservices: We have not produced a scorecard.
Before AAB Meeting 6 (20 November 2024)	In 2023 Airservices engaged Think Research Ltd as a consultant for the independent assurance in response to the Noise Action Plan for Brisbane - Per the factsheet produced by Airservices Australia and available on Engage, Think Research are required to: participate in quarterly community engagement activities and provide information on the independent review of the proposals, options, or assessments associated with each recommendation. - What has Think Research participated in since their appointment so far as it relates to Brisbane Airport? What information has it provided and to who? Can a copy of their reports be made available to the AAB members and to the general public? - What is done with the information in these reports? - Is an action list generated to work on the items they raise?	Airservices: Think Research have participated in a number of actions since their appointment. This includes: - Review of preferred designs to confirm if any further refinement opportunity exist - Discussions with AAB members in mid 2024 on any matters of interest - Offer to AAB members to identify any specific matters they would like Think Research to provide advice on (current AAB open action) - Advice on international flight path change decision making models and their potential application in Australia. Airservices: The information is considered prior to finalising design decisions and to inform other related activity. We look at their role as not only providing advice, but ensuring we have not missed an opportunity for a greater noise improvement outcome. Airservices: No it is not. The reviews are of current work that is under deliberation, so any findings are immediately actioned.

Period	Question	Answer
Before AAB Meeting 10 (19 November 2025)	ASA stated in the Senate Estimates hearing of 7 October 2025 that 28 out of 65 actions are complete re NAP4B, and current package has another 16 that are due. Can we please request a list of those actions and which of them are complete (28) and 16 (due)?	Airservices: We have noted that the figures stated during the hearing only dealt with a portion of the actions. There are 82 actions in total. 64 have been completed with some decisions still pending. 28 have been taken through to implementation or closed with no further action. This item was discussed at the AAB meeting on 19 November 2025.
Before AAB Meeting 10 (19 November 2025)	I request that Airservices Australia provide clarification regarding their recent Senate Estimates statements claiming that “some areas within Brisbane airspace have experienced noise improvements.”	Airservices: This item was discussed at the AAB meeting on 19 November 2025 .
Before AAB Meeting 10 (19 November 2025)	Given the Airservices CEO’s stated focus on measuring the completion of Brisbane Noise Action Plan items, I request a status update identifying: • Actions completed to date; • Actions remaining outstanding; and • Quantifiable evidence supporting any claimed material noise improvements for affected Brisbane community.	Airservices: This item was discussed at the AAB meeting on 19 November 2025 .
Before AAB Meeting 11 (18 March 2026)	How does Airservices define: 1. De-concentration? 2. Noise sharing?	1. Airservices: De-Concentration – Airservices does not use this term and as such cannot provide a definition for it. We have committed through Package 3 of the Noise Action Plan for Brisbane to “reduce the frequency and concentration of flights over communities”. In terms of reducing concentration, this involves reducing the number of flights over communities that may be subject to a high volume of flights, multiple flight paths or both arrivals and departures. In doing so, we will need to shift some of these existing operations over other communities, to share noise across the city. 2. Airservices: Noise Sharing – This involves taking flights away from communities subject to a high number of flights and placing them over other communities with less or no direct overflight to reduce the concentration of operations.
Before AAB Meeting 11 (18 March 2026)	<i>In relation to the Noise Action Plan for Brisbane Program update: October 2025, published on 5 November 2025:</i> Why has Airservices only selectively reported improvements in a few parts of Brisbane instead of presenting the overall Brisbane-wide outcomes the Noise Action Plan for Brisbane is intended to address?	Airservices: The data presented in this update is the data for the changes made, in the locations where they have been made, to this point. We will publish a Noise Action Plan for Brisbane outcomes report when all actions are complete and changes confirmed to share the overall result – what the flight paths used to look like and what they do post changes, the benefits etc.

Flight Path Design

Flight Path Design – Legacy runway changes

Period	Question	Answer																		
Before AAB Meeting 7 (26 February 2025)	Why is the Noise Action Plan for Brisbane only concerned only with impacts on new parallel runway (NPR) communities, not communities impacted by legacy runway operations?	Airservices: The Noise Action Plan for Brisbane is an outcome of the Post Implementation Review (PIR) undertaken for Brisbane Airport flight paths following the opening of the NPR. It is not just focused on new runway flight paths. The Noise Action Plan for Brisbane is considering both legacy runway and new runway operations. The new runway has reduced impacts to legacy runway communities as shown in the Trax heat maps used in August 2024 engagement. The first changes implemented in the Noise Action Plan for Brisbane were legacy runway changes (early turn of turboprop aircraft pre 6am and departures over water during SODPROPS and northerly wind operations).																		
Before AAB Meeting 7 (26 February 2025)	What was the impact of the loss of the cross runway at Brisbane Airport?	Airservices: Additional runway usage data may help inform a shared understanding of the impact on residents of the removal of the cross-runway, noting runways 14/32 is the cross runway which can be seen to have had limited use in 2019, as outlined in the below table (which compares us with 01/19, the legacy runway). <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Runway</th><th>Count</th><th>Percentage</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>14 (cross)</td><td>4406</td><td>2.1%</td></tr> <tr> <td>32 (cross)</td><td>1742</td><td>0.8%</td></tr> <tr> <td>01</td><td>102,411</td><td>48.0%</td></tr> <tr> <td>19</td><td>104,703</td><td>49.1%</td></tr> <tr> <td>Total</td><td>213,262</td><td>100.0%</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Runway	Count	Percentage	14 (cross)	4406	2.1%	32 (cross)	1742	0.8%	01	102,411	48.0%	19	104,703	49.1%	Total	213,262	100.0%
Runway	Count	Percentage																		
14 (cross)	4406	2.1%																		
32 (cross)	1742	0.8%																		
01	102,411	48.0%																		
19	104,703	49.1%																		
Total	213,262	100.0%																		

Period	Question	Answer
Before AAB Meeting 7 (26 February 2025)	Why have flights over communities impacted by legacy runway operations increased so substantially, when the Noise Action Plan for Brisbane is focussed on increasing noise sharing?	Airservices: Projected growth has been approved in airport master planning and is not impacted by flight path design. We acknowledge that air traffic will grow over time. In this context, it is noted that the new runway has significantly reduced traffic to the legacy runway during the day, as in the order of 40 per cent now uses the new runway, but we acknowledge that all night-time traffic uses the legacy runway. We acknowledge that the night-time Noise Abatement Procedure does not allow for noise-sharing between legacy and new runway residents. However, ‘noise-sharing’ is an intended outcome of the Noise Action Plan for Brisbane, not a description of the current distribution of aircraft noise.

Flight Path Design – Modes of operation

Period	Question	Answer
Before AAB Meeting 8 (22 May 2025)	Has mode of operation been taken into account by Trax in the re-design?	Airservices: Not clear what element of Trax work “redesign” refers to, but all modes of operation are considered in reviewing options to reduce impacts on communities.
Before AAB Meeting #9 (27 August 2025)	What runway modes are to be used for Package Three and Package Four?	Airservices: There are no proposals to change runway modes in Package Three; however, arrival flight paths are being changed to support independent parallel runway operations mode use in busy periods. Package Four work is in development.

Flight Path Design – Package Three (preferred options)

Period	Question	Answer
Before AAB Meeting 9 (27 August 2025)	- Has TRAX achieved its de-concentration objective, given Package Three options are designed to reduce frequency and concentration within current airspace constraints? - What criteria and metrics will Airservices be using to assess these options, particularly around noise sharing separation? - What communities are still impacted by multi airport and directional flight paths?	1. Airservices: Trax was not set a ‘de-concentration objective’; they designed Package Four options to meet the overarching aim of reducing frequency and concentration of aircraft noise over some of the most impacted communities. The preferred options developed by Trax have achieved this aim to the best possible extent given the constraints of the current airspace. For example, locations to the north west that previously had both departure and arrival operations over them would be subject to only one of these operations under the preferred options. This represents a reduction in the frequency of overflight and the concentration of operations for these communities. 2. Airservices: Package Three options for Phase Six engagement are designed to work as a whole to reduce frequency and concentration of air traffic. Criteria specific to Package Four are included in assessment of options: Criteria and metrics: - Total population overflown (# people overflown 1km either side of centreline out to 40NM from runway) - Population impacted at: a. 60+dB (# people in +60dB contour) b. 70+dB (# people in +70dB contour) - Track miles and emissions (nautical miles and tonnes of CO2) <i>Specific to Package Three:</i> - Does the option reduce the frequency of flights over the same communities? - Does the option share noise by reducing the concentration of flights? - Does the option reduce the occurrence of communities being subject to both arrivals and departures? - Does the option reduce the impact of merge points and hold downs? - Does the option improve community noise outcomes through facilitating greater use of advanced navigation technology? 3. Airservices: Information is provided in the Baseline Model and in engagement materials in relation to Brisbane Airport operations. Other airport operations are not considered in Package Three.

Period	Question	Answer
Before AAB Meeting 9 (27 August 2025)	What does Airservices use in its modelling to provide for overflight heights and the ability of all aircraft to adhere to SIDS and STARS?	Airservices: Airservices uses the Aviation Environmental Design Tool (AEDT). This is Federal Aviation Administration (USA aviation agency) software used to analyse the environmental impact of aviation activity, specifically focusing on noise, fuel consumption, and emissions. It models aircraft performance, including all flight phases, and can be scaled from a single flight to a global analysis. AEDT is a key tool for environmental impact assessments in aviation internationally. We acknowledge there will always be variation in altitudes and tracking based on aircraft types/performance, weather, pilots, airline policies and other traffic.
Before AAB Meeting 9 (27 August 2025)	What is Airservices' decision-making process for preferred options?	Airservices: The decision-making process for preferred options assesses each option against the intent of the Noise Action Plan for Brisbane recommendations. It also includes assessment using our Flight Path Design Principles. This assessment is transparently documented in the Preferred Option Assessment Reports that we release on the Engage Airservices website. <u>Flight Path Design Principles</u> Safety of air navigation is the most important consideration. Flight path design must comply with Australian and international design standards and cater for the range of aircraft that will operate on the flight paths. The following are considered having first given regard to safety and compliance with standards: • concentrating aircraft operations to avoid noise sensitive sites; • potential impacts on social, economic, and cultural values of communities and locations, including Indigenous and other heritage places; • where high-density residential areas are exposed to noise, consider flight path designs that distribute aircraft operations, so that noise can be shared; • where noise exposure is unavoidable, consider Noise Abatement Procedures that adjust aircraft operations to reduce noise impacts, including consideration of the time of these operations; • current and expected future noise exposure when designing flight paths; • Matters of National Environmental Significance, other sensitive habitats, and registered heritage sites; • flight paths that deliver operational efficiency and predictability and minimise the effect on the environment through reducing fuel consumption and emissions; • flight paths to facilitate access to all appropriate airspace users; • flight paths that optimise airport capacity and meet future airport requirements; • flight paths that optimise overall network operations, including consideration of operations at adjacent airports; and • innovation and technology advancements in navigation and aircraft design.

Period	Question	Answer
Before AAB Meeting 9 (27 August 2025)	Will environmental assessments be developed for each option?	Airservices: Preliminary Environmental Impact Assessments for all preferred options were released as part of Phase Six engagement. Environmental Impact Assessments are undertaken consistent with Airservices' standard for Environmental Management of Changes to Aircraft Operations (AA-NOENV-2.100). Environmental Impact Assessments will be completed for the final design of all changes that are progressed to implementation.

Flight Path Design – Package Three – Departure routes over land

Period	Question	Answer
Before AAB Meeting 9 (27 August 2025)	Can Airservices confirm that BIXAD will remain carrying those departing aircraft to the north/east and Asia as it does now?	Airservices: BIXAD would remain to carry traffic to the north as it does now. WACKO would not be taking on traffic from BIXAD.

Flight Path Design – Package Three – Movement of RNP-AR Join Point

Period	Question	Answer
Before AAB Meeting 6 (20 November 2024)	Set 2 concept 3 covered the following: 3.1z) Investigate moving the RNP-AR join point to the new runway further north (similar to the old river track) – The factsheet for set 2 concept 3 (refer Set 2, Concept 3 Factsheet) said the use of an RNP-AR similar to the River Track was dismissed due to safety, but there was no information given on this and no commentary on the noise relief which would be provided through it. - Understanding that safe operation is a priority, why is this flight path currently in use, but the Trax plan says it can't be used? - Was this option dismissed too early? - Is this something that Think Research can consider?	Airservices: It is not currently in use. The safety risk was described in the information sheet addressing this recommendation. It noted that shifting the join point for the RNP-AR would result in aircraft flying head to head if joining the new runway and legacy runway by RNP-AR at the same time, which is not compliant with safety standards. Airservices: No. Safety is Airservices highest priority and this option did not meet the required safety standards and as such no investigation of noise relief was conducted. Airservices: We can ask Think Research to review this and provide further detail if the AAB desires.

Flight Path Design – Package Four

Period	Question	Answer
Before AAB Meeting 6 (20 November 2024)	If the purpose of the NAP4B was to create redesign that would enable relief from concentrated and convergence of flight paths, how is Airservices and TRAX going to be able to achieve this if using the same or similar airspace over the same communities?	Airservices: Package Four is looking at options outside the constraints of the existing airspace design, with the aim of determining if there are lower impact ways to design and manage Brisbane aircraft operations, noting they still need to give regard to the constraints of adjoining airspace operations.
Before AAB Meeting 7 (26 February 2025)	Will multiple flight paths for legacy runway departures be considered as part of Package Four?	Airservices: This is not a specific action in the Noise Action Plan for Brisbane but is appropriate to consider in Package Four. We have confirmed with Trax that this is the case. Package Four also includes investigating options to alternate the use of the two runways – so departures in all directions would take off only from the new runway for a period and then from the legacy runway only. This would require additional departure flight paths for both runways.
Before AAB Meeting 10 (19 November 2025)	I have reviewed information available on Package Four. Airservices' information discusses introducing multiple arrivals routes over the city, but does not mention departures routes. Does that mean departure routes are not being considered, and if so, why not? Either way, in providing respite, are you aiming for providing it at high-capacity times?	Airservices: Package Four is only considering arrivals in this capacity. The specific action is: <i>4.2a) The NPR flight path design includes several arrival routes that use advanced navigation standards for more precise and flexible approaches, and which may be re-configured and supplemented with additional routes to deliver planned respite for some communities through alternation.</i> We anticipate that the ability to use highly precise navigation (RNP-AR) is a key requirement to develop multiple flight paths servicing the same route, thus providing options for respite with the planes sticking to the path in use at the time. Departures operations in Australia do not involve RNP-AR procedures and as we have seen often have vectoring at around 5000ft, so this level of accuracy would not be available. In terms of respite periods, this would be outside of peak traffic times. The parallel runways have been built to cater for higher traffic volumes, so we would not expect to constrain this capacity when needed. Melbourne's Noise Sharing Plan is also focused outside peak periods, so it is consistent with the approach there too. Package Four was discussed in further detail during the AAB meeting of 19 November 2025.

Flight Path Design – Southern Approach

Period	Question	Answer
Before AAB Meeting 6 (20 November 2024)	Daytime relief - While the Ministerial directive to use more SODPROPS will help noise abatement at night and over bayside suburbs, the majority of flights are during the day over land, with southern approach flightpaths to Brisbane Airport carrying increasing aircraft numbers, often continuous up to 15 hours a day for both NPR and Legacy residents. This affects schools, houses, workplaces (including those working from home) and hospitals etc. With day flight numbers greater than night, and given the NPR was approved on the basis that most flights would be going over Moreton Bay (and in the case of New Farm we would not be experiencing many flights), what steps will Airservices be taking to mitigate the impact of aircraft noise created by these heavily used southern approach flightpaths over land, particularly during the day?	Airservices: The recently announced flight path changes were part of the Ministerial Directive (Air Services (Use of Simultaneous Opposite Direction Parallel Runway Operations at Brisbane Airport) Direction 2024) to enable the use of SODPROPS mode during daytime hours when conditions suit. This was confirmed as part of the announcement. The Brisbane Airport Corporation Environmental Impact Statement, which was subject to the approval by government, stated that in 2015 only around 10 to 17 per cent of daytime flights would be in SODPROPS mode and that the remainder would be in parallel runway modes. The EIS also shows this reducing to no daytime use by 2035. We are now into 2024 so almost half way between these forecast periods. The Noise Action Plan for Brisbane is seeking to identify opportunities to minimise noise impacts across Greater Brisbane, including in daytime hours, however we are not able to remove or reduce all operations over all communities, particularly as aircraft movements grow over time.

Land Use Planning and Development

Master Plan and Major Development Plan processes

Period	Question	Answer
Before AAB Meeting 6 (20 November 2024)	At the last AAB meeting (9 September 2024) I asked what the timeline and process was Airport Master Plans and Major Development Plans. The department agreed to provide this information, but it has not been received.	Department (Department of Infrastructure, Transportation, Regional Development, Communications, Sport and the Arts): The Chair has discussed this with the department and asked for a plain language document with statutory timeframes. This document was tabled in AAB Meeting 6 .
Before AAB Meeting 6 (20 November 2024)	Many Brisbane residents did not receive any notice or consultation regarding NPR despite being in the same house for 20 years. What processes are in place to rectify it this time, and will an extended period be allowed for responses given the numerous issues that remain unaddressed following the completion of the NPR? Will noise impacts be considered and data provided to residents during the consultation process for each of these items?	Brisbane Airport Corporation (BAC): The consultation summary undertaken for the NPR is available at Brisbane-Airport-Community-Engagement-Communications-Report-New Runway.pdf The timeline for the 2026 Master Plan timeline and process was presented to the community representatives at the BACACG meeting in September 2024. The summary is: • 2024-mid 25: planning, writing & documentation • July 2025: Public comment period (60 business days, which generally amounts to around three calendar months) and finalisation. • March 2026: Draft plan submitted for Ministerial approval. Community submissions are included as part of the draft plan. Noise impacts will be considered and BAC will provide updated noise forecasts as required by the relevant regulations.
Before AAB Meeting 6 (20 November 2024)	Has the department given BAC and Airservices a list of what information it requires to be produced on noise impacts for these processes? If so, can or will this be shared with residents?	Department: Requirements for Master Plan and Major Development Plan relating to noise are set out in the <i>Airports Act 1996</i> . This is summarised in the document tabled in AAB Meeting 6 . Airservices: The information required is contained in the National Airports Safeguarding Framework (Guideline A) and requires the following minimum areas must be notified: • within the 20 Australia Noise Exposure Forecast (ANEF) • 20 or more daily events greater than 70 dB(A) • 50 or more daily events of greater than 65 dB(A) • 100 events or more daily events of greater than 60 dB(A) or 6 or more events of greater than 60 dB(A) between the hours of 11pm and 6 am.

Period	Question	Answer
Before AAB Meeting 10 (19 November 2025)	I request that Brisbane Airport Corporation (BAC) provide detailed information on the noise reduction and abatement action plans contained in the new Preliminary Draft 2026 Master Plan. Given that aircraft movements are projected to almost double—from 225,000 in 2026 to nearly 382,000 by 2046—and passenger numbers are forecast to increase from 25.7 million to 52.3 million, this has significant implications for residents already severely affected by aircraft noise. A key concern with the draft Master Plan is its reliance on outdated ANEF noise contour mapping, based on only two years of noise data. This methodology fails to accurately represent the true extent of aircraft overflights or how far noise travels from current flight paths.	BAC: The Preliminary Draft Master Plan is available for download at Brisbane Airport 2026 Master Plan. Presentations were provided to the AAB at the start of the public consultation period. The ANEF noise contour mapping is not based on 2 years of data. The mapping is based on the estimated ultimate capacity of the airport (approximately 501,000 movements/annum).
Before AAB Meeting 12 (24 June 2026)	If the previously identified New Farm monitoring issues have not been resolved, how do these issues affect BAC's analysis, including its Draft Master Plan?	BAC: BAC is unaware of problems with the New Farm Noise Monitor. There is no impact on the Master Plan analysis.
Before AAB Meeting 12 (24 June 2026)	Given BAC's current Casper-based network in Appendix B does not appear to include New Farm, how is aircraft noise currently monitored by BAC in New Farm?	BAC: BAC uses the Airservices New Farm monitor data when required.
Before AAB Meeting 12 (24 June 2026)	How was this area assessed for the BAC Draft Master Plan (refer Appendix C that includes New Farm) if the monitors do not cover this area?	BAC: The AEDT model assesses all areas of Brisbane – it is not necessary to have a monitor in every location for the preparation on the ANEF.
Before AAB Meeting 12 (24 June 2026)	BAC to confirm approach to communicating changes between the preliminary draft Master Plan and Final Master Plan, including any changes relevant to aircraft noise outcomes.	BAC: BAC does not normally communicate changes between the draft Master Plan and the final Master Plan. The only change to Chapter 12 (Aircraft Noise) was the inclusion of the highlighted words on page 184 of the Master Plan: <i>The AEDT has the advantage of being calibrated with the equivalent of two years of actual flight and noise data from the new operations and flight paths introduced with the opening of the western runway.</i>

Noise Complaints

Noise Complaints and Information Service

Period	Question	Answer
Before AAB Meeting 6 (20 November 2024)	Ability to email Noise Complaints and Information Service (NCIS) – <i>In recent changes, NCIS only allow complaints to be submitted via an online form or via Webtrak which links to the same form. There is therefore no ability to email in screenshots or photographs of issues. It is often difficult to explain an issue without these visual aids to refer to. It also means that we are unable to provide crucial evidence relevant to investigations.</i> How can Airservices justify this change and can they update their system to allow for this material to be submitted so as to properly consider the issues which affected Brisbane residents have?	Airservices: NCIS has not accepted email submissions since 2015 when a new complaints system was introduced. The system has automated functions that support processing of enquiries to the correct airport location and to an existing complainant if relevant. Emails require manual processing which extends response time and may introduce errors in cumulative data collection. Under our IT and Cyber Security Policy, opening of links and files from outside the organisation is also not allowed due to the risk of malware and other cyber security attacks. Thus review of any email attachments is not allowed unless the source is verified. Please note that NCIS also accept complaints by telephone and letter.

Public Information and Reporting

Public Information and Reporting – Relationship between potential lowering of cloud ceiling and tailwind trial

Period	Question	Answer
Before AAB Meeting 12 (24 June 2026)	<i>During a community presentation in September 2023, Airservices proposed applying to CASA to lower the cloud ceiling requirement from 2500 ft to 2000 ft as a potential mitigation measure.</i> <i>However, an update published on ASA's Engage page in March 2026 states: "In September 2025, having met with CASA and conducted safety and risk assessments, we determined that it is not feasible to safely change the cloud ceiling limit and maintain the required visibility needed to use this mode."</i> Why was the September 2025 outcome not communicated to the AAB earlier?	Airservices: Airservices agrees that it is appropriate to share information on decisions with the AAB ahead of public release. This was an oversight in this case, due to the decisions not relating to flight path change announcements. We will endeavour to ensure all Noise Action Plan for Brisbane decisions are shared with the AAB ahead of release in the future.
Before AAB Meeting 12 (24 June 2026)	Please confirm if the tailwind trial is being conducted only within the existing 2500 ft cloud ceiling constraint and no alternative cloud ceiling settings are being considered as part of the tailwind trial or related work?	Airservices: Confirmed. Brisbane Airport Corporation (BAC): The tailwind trial does not have a cloud base limitation.
Before AAB Meeting 12 (24 June 2026)	Was the anticipated benefit of the cloud ceiling proposal incorporated into planning assumptions (including the BAC Master Plan)? If so, how has this now been adjusted?	BAC: No.
Before AAB Meeting 12 (24 June 2026)	Whether these two initiatives (tailwind trial and cloud ceiling) were developed as separate or coordinated workstreams?	Airservices: The cloud ceiling proposal was investigated and, due to identified impacts to safety outcomes, closed. The tailwind trial is not considered an alternative mitigation to this. BAC: No.
Before AAB Meeting 12 (24 June 2026)	What specific safety and operational constraints led CASA and ASA to conclude that lowering the cloud ceiling to 2000 ft is not feasible?	Airservices: It was determined that the SODPROPS cloud base cannot safely be lowered any further at Brisbane as visual sighting of aircraft is required within the local airspace to ensure vertical and/or lateral separation of aircraft arriving and departing over the same area is maintained. Lowering the cloud base means this visual sighting would be lost within the area where it needs to be maintained.

Period	Question	Answer
Before AAB Meeting 12 (24 June 2026)	What analysis underpinned that conclusion (e.g. scenarios tested, parameters assessed, risk thresholds applied)?	Airservices: Aircservices' Risk Intelligence team investigated historical movement data; position and altitude of departing and arriving aircraft; and achievement of vertical or lateral separation standards with respect to potential cloud base options in 100ft increments. Further risk modelling and analysis by Aircservices's Service Standards considered conditions related to allowing the tower controller to visually monitor departing aircraft, and establishment of aircraft on final approach.
Before AAB Meeting 12 (24 June 2026)	Were any alternative approaches explored (such as different visibility thresholds, conditional or time-limited use or other operational limits that might allow its use)?	Airservices: Other options were investigated including applying an "at or below 2000ft" requirement to departures and increasing the degree of turn to the right upon take-off. It was found that all other options that we explored would potentially introduce additional safety issues or additional noise impacts to coastal communities and were therefore progressed no further.
Before AAB Meeting 12 (24 June 2026)	Have international comparisons been done, for example airports where the cloud ceiling is not a condition for SODPROPS?	Airservices: The only other location SODPROPS is used in Australia is Sydney where there is a cloud ceiling condition of 3000ft. SODPROPS is rarely implemented globally because it requires unique geographical layouts—like parallel runways adjacent to large uninhabited areas (such as bodies of water)—coupled with low traffic volume and calm weather.
Before AAB Meeting 12 (24 June 2026)	Given earlier indications of approximately 1,200 additional bay movements, how is the loss of this mitigation now being addressed? What alternative measures are being pursued to deliver equivalent noise relief?	Airservices: The provision of data on potential additional SODPROPS movements that might be achievable if should the cloud base could be reduced, was for context only. It was not a commitment to providing this additional number through one means or another. Reducing the cloud ceiling limit was one of a range of options explored through the Noise Action Plan for Brisbane. The actions implemented through the program have resulted in use of the mode almost doubling from 2024 (2926 SODPROPS flights) to 2025 (5683 SODPROPS flights).
Before AAB Meeting 12 (24 June 2026)	Has the Minister been advised of this outcome and its implications for the overall effectiveness and limitations of SODPROPS?	Airservices: Aircservices has met the requirements of the Minister's direction regarding SODPROPS including reporting requirements.

Public Information and Reporting – Accuracy and availability

Period	Question	Answer
Before AAB Meeting 6 (20 November 2024)	<i>Planes flying versus published:</i> <i>Planes are clearly directly above my house, but when I view them on these systems they show them over the river. I would estimate they are out by at least 1km</i> Why do the planes in reality versus what shows on Webtrak and Flight Radar 24 differ? Is it an accuracy issue with the tracking system or is this some other reason? Can this be reviewed before the next phase of consultation to ensure the correct data is being used?	Airservices: WebTrak is based on radar data feeds and is accurate. Flight Radar 24's website says they use aircraft data, which does not use a localised measure of altitude above mean sea level. It states 'This is why altitude values near the ground can sometimes appear unrealistic.' Depending on the altitude of an aircraft, its perceived position relative to someone on the ground will change. A lower aircraft will more obviously appear off to the side of a location. A higher aircraft will appear to be directly over a location when it is actually a kilometre or more to the side. Lateral distance is extremely difficult to gauge from the ground when an aircraft is at a higher altitude and when looking up to the sky where there are no visual landmarks against which to compare aircraft location. More information on the accuracy of WebTrak can be found here – WebTrak - Airservices.
Before AAB Meeting 11 (18 March 2026)	Are there current performance issues with Webtrak , and if so, when are these likely to be rectified?	Airservices: Yes, there are issues with WebTrak historical, we notified the providers of the platform and are awaiting outcomes. We share the community's frustration with the diminished performance of this useful feature.
Before AAB Meeting 12 (24 June 2026)	Many in the community have reported that WebTrak is slow and often does not load. This prevents complaints being made via WebTrak/NCIS to ASA. Therefore, ASA's monthly updates to its Board and the public may understate noise complaint numbers. What impact, if any, has the acquisition of Envirosuite by Ideagen (August 2025) had on ASA's noise monitoring systems and WebTrak functionality?	Airservices: There have been no reports to Airservices of WebTrak being slow or not loading, only of issues with historical replay at high speeds. There have been no concerns reported to Airservices by community members that they have been unable to use WebTrak to lodge complaints. We strongly encourage community members to report any such difficulties to us at communityengagement@airservicesaustralia.com Provision of noise monitoring services and WebTrak functionality has not been impacted by the provider's corporate arrangements.
Before AAB Meeting 12 (24 June 2026)	What service level agreement does ASA have with WebTrak (or its provider) and what reliability and availability standards are expected? Are there known issues with the system?	Airservices: Service level agreements are commercial arrangements not generally discussed externally, but it is expected that WebTrak is available 24hrs a day, 7 days a week. There are known issues with higher speed historical playback and, as a result, these are no longer available on WebTrak.
Before AAB Meeting 12 (24 June 2026)	How do BAC and ASA expect the public to interpret and reconcile data from two separate monitoring systems?	Airservices: There is no expectation that community members would do this across more than one platform. BAC: It is expected the public will choose which platform they prefer and use it.

Period	Question	Answer
Before AAB Meeting 12 (24 June 2026)	Do BAC and ASA have arrangements in place to share data from the two separate systems?	Airservices: Brisbane Airport's noise monitors at the 'city' runway ends are both live on WebTrak. BAC: Not currently. BAC does receive noise monitor data from Airservices when requested - for example Airservices noise monitor data was used in the calibration of the AEDT model for the 2026 MP.
Before AAB Meeting 12 (24 June 2026)	What other issues arise from having two separate systems?	Airservices: No issues have been identified. BAC: Nil.
Before AAB Meeting 12 (24 June 2026)	Are there any plans to integrate these systems or provide a unified interface?	Airservices: Provision of the national noise monitoring and flight path information system, including public-facing platforms, is the responsibility of Airservices. This does not prevent an airport from also providing reporting to the community. BAC: Not currently – but both systems have been purchased by IdeaGen. We anticipate there will be some consolidation in the product line in the future.

Public Information and Reporting – Airservices Baseline Model

Period	Question	Answer
Before AAB Meeting #10 (19 November 2025)	Over the past few weeks, since the onset of northerly winds for the spring and summer season, I have been inundated with complaints from residents located to the north and west of the airport. Since the opening of the NPR/West Runway in 2020, Airservices has engaged with the community on several occasions. However, there has been no official advice provided to the affected communities regarding any changes to flight paths in the north-west corridor. After reviewing the Airservices Baseline Model over several years, it is evident that flight path changes have occurred between 2023 and 2024, resulting in a greater concentration of flight paths over communities that were already impacted. Enclosed are two graphics showing the 2023 and 2024 northerly arrival flight paths, highlighting where these changes appear to have been made. Could Airservices please provide clarification on the following: • What was the methodology for implementing the changes to these flight paths? • How do these changes align with the NAP4B principle of deconcentrating flight paths? • Why were the impacted communities not consulted prior to these changes being made? • Could Airservices please provide an explanation that can be shared with the community through our AAB Advocacy?	Airservices: The baseline model “Historic Maps and Data” section shows the actual aircraft tracking for full year periods. This is based on radar data which is overlaid on the published flight paths represented as a 2 km wide corridor (per their standard approach to flight path representation). The purpose is to enable community members to compare actual tracking to published flight path location. In looking into the issue raised in relation to 2024 data, Airservices identified that while the actual radar track data is correctly represented, the system shows the most commonly flown corridor for each path rather than the published flight path. This is not the intent of this reporting, and Airservices is getting this rectified. The system incorrectly identified the most commonly tracked corridor for the WOODY arrivals for 2024, giving the appearance of a changed flight path. Airservices confirms that no changes have been made to these flight paths and that any intention to do so would involve two rounds of community engagement as committed to in the Noise Action Plan for Brisbane Communications Approach and in Airservices’ Community Engagement Standard. Airservices has instructed the supplier of the baseline model to remove the 2 km corridors depicting the most commonly flown route and replace them with the published flight paths.

Public Information and Reporting – New airline services

Period	Question	Answer
Before AAB Meeting 6 (20 November 2024)	Increasing flight numbers: <i>It seems that currently the public only get notice of new airline services for Brisbane Airport through social media announcements from Brisbane Airport Corporation.</i> - Is it correct that there is no process for notifying residents of an increase in flights from an airline, either an increase in frequency of a current service, or the start of a brand new service, even though each additional plane has a direct impact on residents overflown by it? - Why are directly impacted Brisbane residents not given any notice of these changes but a lot of effort goes into social media posts and media releases, photo opportunities etc? - Can BAC and Airservices please advise when do they consider the increased and cumulative noise impact on residents as a result of the ongoing increase in Brisbane Airport related flights? - Can residents be given notice of these new services and a period for consultation, including details of the times at which these new flights are anticipated to be during the 24 hour operations of the Brisbane Airport e.g. during 6am to 10pm and from 10pm to 6 am.	BAC: In general, high profile new services (e.g. Brisbane – Dallas) are announced jointly by BAC and the associated airline through both mainstream media and social media channels. Other new services (e.g. an additional Brisbane-Sydney flight) are normally not announced by BAC, although the operating airline often publishes notifications through their usual channels. In both cases, the announcements are public and residents would receive the same notification as the wider public audience. BAC: Details of upcoming additional services and growth forecasts are provided at the quarterly Brisbane Airport Community Aviation Consultation Group meetings, for representatives of Brisbane communities. BAC: BAC considers the impact of noise on communities as part of their Master Plan process. This consideration is a regulated requirement of the Master Plan process, and prescribes the assessment and information (e.g. ANEF, N70, N60 contours) that must be published. Note: <i>Refer to the Land Use Planning and Development section of this document for further information on Master Plan requirements.</i> BAC: As per global industry norm Brisbane Airport does not consult with the public on requests from airlines for new services. Feedback on growth is invited through the Master Plan process, and through the community representatives that attend BACACG. Airservices: Brisbane Airport Corporation's approval for the new runway included a future forecast for growth in aircraft movements. This future forecast was part of the project approval, as was 24-hour operation of the airport. Airservices Australia does not provide advance notice of increasing aircraft movements, however regular updates on growth are provided by BAC through the BACACG, and reports on movement numbers from previous months are available on Aircraft In Your Neighbourhood.
Before AAB Meeting 9 (27 August 2025)	Are any noise management initiatives being implemented in relation to the recently announced Cathay Pacific freight flights? Has BAC considered any noise abatement initiatives to materially limit the level of noise that these flights and any similar future flights will impact upon our communities?	BAC: No additional noise management initiatives are being implemented specifically for the Cathay Pacific freight flight. BAC considers the impact of aircraft noise on communities and works closely with Airservices on minimising impacts through initiatives such as the NAP4B. Points of clarification in relation to the flights are set out below: - The service is once per week (Tuesdays); - The service previously operated to Wellcamp. The initial contract period for the service ended and Cathay elected to move to Brisbane to complement their other services; - The service is scheduled to arrive and depart during evening hours, and is not operating in the night hours; - The aircraft is a 747-800 freighter, that meets the ICAO Chapter 14 requirements.

Public Information and Reporting – Noise monitoring

Period	Question	Answer
Before AAB Meeting 6 (20 November 2024)	Noise monitor issues at New Farm – In 2022 Airservices provided data of the Modelled vs Actual aircraft noise from a number of suburbs. The conclusion reached by Airservices was: This review has identified that New Farm has a notable difference between the modelled and actual noise results, while other locations are largely consistent with forecast noise levels. - Can Airservices update this table to include updated columns for the period: 01/08/2021 to 31/07/2022 01/08/2022 to 31/07/2023 01/08/2023 to 31/07/2024. - If this information is recorded and reported on, what actions are taken by Airservices and BAC in response to these reports? - Does someone within Airservices monitor these reports, and investigate and recommend actions to be taken by airlines or ATC (Air Traffic Control) to reduce the noise to below 70db? - Is there a system for example to investigate airlines that are repeat offenders of going over this noise limit or a certain plane type? - Several Airservices and Trax reports have identified issues at the Brisbane Powerhouse noise monitor at New Farm. This included issues with the contours and also that it did not pick up RNP-AR. Given this report was in 2022, what steps have been taken to rectify the noise monitor issues at this location before changes to flight path design are implemented?	Airservices: The noise monitor reports for New Farm over the last 12 months available on Aircraft In Your Neighbourhood show a number of noise events with most at 65 to 75dB, some above 75dB and a single event in the 105dB range. Airservices: The information is recorded and reported through Aircraft In Your Neighbourhood. Noise monitoring is conducted for a range of reasons including to provide accurate information on aircraft flight paths and noise to the community and other stakeholders, and to provide data to determine potential environmental (noise) impacts from existing and proposed new flight paths and noise abatement trials. We are implementing the Noise Action Plan for Brisbane in response to noise information and community concerns across Greater Brisbane. Airservices: The vast majority of reported noise events are at a 65 and 70 decibel level, noting a much smaller number at 75 and sometimes 80 which would likely be the heavier international aircraft. Events above these levels would likely be caused by other noise sources such as birds or a loud machine nearby. We regularly review noise monitoring data, both as part of options development and assessment and also to maintain awareness of aircraft operations over Greater Brisbane. Where we observe higher than expected noise levels, we will ask our consultants to review the audio of these to determine the cause. We are implementing the Noise Action Plan for Brisbane which is seeking to improve noise outcomes. Airservices: There is no maximum allowable level for aircraft noise against which to investigate airline operators. Noise standards for aircraft are set out in Annex 16, Volume I and the Air Navigation (Aircraft Noise) Regulations 2018. Airservices: We have conducted temporary noise monitoring in Hawthorne and will review noise monitor locations toward the end of the Noise Action Plan for Brisbane. The noise monitor is operating as expected in monitoring Instrument Landing System flight path movements and as noted, some aircraft are producing higher noise levels than forecast. This is not an issue with the noise monitor but rather identifies that the operations are not consistent with what was forecast when the studies were done. We noted in the Post Implementation Review report that the Environmental Impact Statement and later final design Environmental Impact Assessment forecasts were based on the best available information at the time.

Period	Question	Answer
Before AAB Meeting 12 (24 June 2026)	Does ASA agree with the statements made by BAC on the BAC webpage regarding noise monitor locations and program details? If not, what is the correct information?	Airservices: Assuming this is the web page referenced Noise Monitors Brisbane Airport; and this is the text referenced: <i>Airservices Australia Noise Monitors</i> <i>Airservices Australia is primarily responsible for monitoring aircraft noise with a number of fixed noise monitors placed around Brisbane. Details of the information collected is displayed in the Airservices WebTrak tool.</i> <i>Additional noise monitors were placed in the community prior to the opening of the new runway.</i> <i>In early 2020, Brisbane Airport developed the first combined Airport / Airservices Aircraft Performance and Noise Program in Australia. Recognising the sensitivity of residents to major changes in aircraft noise patterns, this program includes the provision of six extra noise monitors in addition to the eight permanent noise monitors already in use by Airservices. Four temporary noise monitors have been placed in New Farm, Bardon, Carina and Hamilton, plus two permanent noise monitors south of the two runways.</i> <i>How can I find out more:</i> <i>For current information on flight paths and aircraft movements at your address, visit Airservices Australia's Aircraft in your Neighbourhood website.</i> It is correct that Airservices had eight permanent noise monitors in place and that a further six were added, per BAC's statement on their website. Airservices also has two temporary noise monitors in addition to this, that are moved to different locations as required.
Before AAB Meeting 12 (24 June 2026)	Both ASA and Trax have previously published reports which have identified potential issues with noise monitoring in New Farm. Have these issues been resolved? If so, how?	Airservices: In the Post Implementation Review (PIR) following opening of the new runway, Airservices' reviewed modelled versus actual noise outcomes and identified that New Farm had a notable difference between the modelled and actual noise results as opposed to an issue with the actual monitoring. As such, there is no issue to resolve with the noise monitor. PIR recommendations were developed to address these sorts of differences where practicable. Most other locations were largely consistent with forecast noise levels (see factsheet: Aircraft Noise Modelled vs Actuals Summary 2022 (338 KB) (pdf)) We are not aware of any Trax reports identifying potential issues with noise monitoring in New Farm.
Before AAB Meeting 12 (24 June 2026)	How does the monitoring system distinguish between aircraft using the RNP-AR flight path and those using the ILS path?	Airservices: The system does not differentiate between the specific approach procedure being used, as it is based on overflight of the monitor not use of a procedure. The monitor records noise; the system identifies and excludes non-aircraft noise and correlates confirmed aircraft noise events with the relevant aircraft based on air traffic control surveillance radars.

Period	Question	Answer
Before AAB Meeting 12 (24 June 2026)	Are there two separate monitors in New Farm for accuracy and to measure the cumulative impact on those caught in the V of these two paths?	Airservices: There is only one noise monitor in New Farm. An additional temporary monitor was placed in Hawthorne in 2024 in response to community request for monitoring sited directly in line with the new runway.
Before AAB Meeting 12 (24 June 2026)	Given the inconsistencies across systems and publications, can BAC and ASA jointly provide a consolidated list of all aircraft noise monitors (from the EIS period onwards, say 2007)?	Airservices: Yes, but this will take some time to collate due to the request to go back as far as 2007. BAC: BAC has published reports from a range of temporary noise monitors – these are available on the BAC website.
Before AAB Meeting 12 (17 June 2026)	If the BAC webpage refers to a "temporary noise monitor" in New Farm, does this mean the monitor near the Brisbane Powerhouse is temporary or does this refer to another monitor or monitors? If so, what is the current status of the temporary monitor(s)?	BAC: Both BAC and Airservices have temporary monitors that can be deployed for short duration monitoring. Currently none are deployed in the Brisbane area.
Before AAB Meeting 12 (17 June 2026)	Where exactly was the temporary New Farm monitor referred to by the Casper representative deployed?	BAC: It was deployed at an address on Oxlade Drive, New Farm.
Before AAB Meeting 12 (17 June 2026)	Where can the resulting data or report be accessed?	BAC: The data was not collated into a report. The monitor was installed as a functional demonstration of the Casper system prior to purchase by BAC.
Before AAB Meeting 12 (17 June 2026)	Why has data from the New Farm temporary monitor not been published when other temporary monitoring locations have been reported?	BAC: It was part of the proof of concept and was not intended for data gathering.

Public Information and Reporting – Operating mode

Period	Question	Answer
Before AAB Meeting 7 (26 February 2025)	Where can the public receive information on change of mode?	We are working with our WebTrak provider to include this information on WebTrak. While the firm timing is not yet confirmed, this should occur this calendar year. BAC also publishes a Runway Usage Forecast on their website, which forecasts the modes that will be used over the next 54 hours based on weather data and time of day. This will not include the use of segregated mode due to unplanned issues that affect capacity, but will consider planned runway maintenance work and the modes planned to manage this.

Public Information and Reporting – Route growth forecasts

Period	Question	Answer
Before AAB Meeting 10 (19 November 2025)	With regard to Action Item 1.1 – Route Growth Forecasts: - Can ASA clarify why this item has been marked as complete when the work is not yet finalised? - Can ASA consider using the attached report format, which includes growth forecasts and altitude differentiation, and advise whether this approach can be adopted?	Airservices: Airservices marked the action as complete in reference to the request to prepare a map similar to the BFPCA produced example noting current usage numbers for each flight path using the BFPCA parameters. This was completed and provided to the AAB ahead of the last round of engagement and was published on our Engage page during the engagement to support community understanding of current operations. Airservices does not include growth forecasts in our assessment of flight path changes, as we are not responsible for these forecasts. They are prepared by airports as part of the five yearly Master Plan cycle. Brisbane Airport is working on providing further information on future growth, noting it is not possible to allocate this to each flight path as while overall traffic growth can be forecast, the origin and destination cannot. An example of this is China. China accounted for a large portion of Brisbane Airport's international traffic volume pre-COVID. Post COVID it has reduced significantly. Thus, planes that used to fly on the flight paths servicing China, no longer do so. As noted during meeting 9, BAC has undertaken to produce these route growth forecasts. The Action Item will remain open until BAC publishes these forecasts, as noted in the minutes for meeting 9.
Before AAB Meeting 10 (19 November 2025)	With regard to Action Item 1.1 – Route Growth Forecasts: Can ASA obtain and present the UK Think Research example mentioned in the 10 September virtual meeting, including how 10-year growth forecasts were incorporated into flight path design, and provide feedback on its applicability?	Airservices: Think provided further information on the UK example mentioned during the session. This was for new proposed departure routes for Edinburgh Airport. Generally, this is a two-step process: 1. Future traffic forecast conducted for airport – Considers factors such as local travel demographics, changes in travel patterns and economic growth expectations to provide a traffic forecast on an annual and peak day basis for several future years. 2. Map traffic forecasts to flight routes – Considers facts such as the origin/destination of each flight, future airspace routes, and likely airline preferences for different routes. It is not scientific and does not normally include sensitivity analysis. With all forecasts, they are exactly that. Travel patterns might change substantially in 10 years, so it is all indicative and not a guarantee or constraint on airspace use.

Period	Question	Answer
Before AAB Meeting 11 (18 March 2026)	Is it possible to track volumes from the start of the Noise Action Plan for Brisbane and forecast them forward, given current positions from the relevant authorities?	Airservices: Airservices can look at volumes from January 2023 and compare them to volumes once all changes are made, but we are not able to forecast these into the future. Brisbane Airport Corporation's Master Plan is the best source of this future forecast information. Note: As noted during meeting 9, BAC has undertaken to produce route growth forecasts under Action Item 1.1. The Action Item will remain open until BAC publishes these forecasts, as noted in the minutes for meeting 9.

Public Information and Reporting – Significant events notifications

Period	Question	Answer
Before AAB Meeting 6 (20 November 2024)	Runway closure Saturday 2 November 2024 – On Saturday 2 November, Legacy Runway was shut without any notice to residents for an entire day. This meant that NPR took all arrivals and departures for the entire day. There was no notice on Webtrak, and 4 hours or more after the closure had already started Brisbane Airport Corporation put up a notice on Facebook to say that it would be shut until 6pm. - Why was notice not given to Brisbane residents by either BAC or Airservices? - When notice was finally given via a post on Facebook why was it so delayed? - What other methods did BAC or Airservices use to notify residents of this event and what suggestions do BAC and Airservices have for improving the system of notifying Brisbane residents in a timely manner and when can these improvements be implemented?	BAC: The closure was unplanned and occurred due to a pavement failure. It was not possible to provide advance notification. BAC: For planned maintenance related runway closures BAC takes a proactive approach to providing advance notification. However, on this occasion the runway closure was caused by a pavement failure at the juncture of bitumen and concrete surfaces. This appeared to be caused by recent periods of heavy rain that resulted in some sub-surface movement. The runway was closed at around 6am for repairs, with the intention of a rapid repair and a quick restoration of normal operations. Some services are not readily available on weekend days (contracting staff, asphalt plant) and so the repairs took significantly longer than anticipated. The Facebook post was published when it became apparent the closure would be for an extended period of time. BAC: BAC normally uses social media channels and posts on the BNE website to inform residents of significant events. This has been in place for a number of years and feedback has been positive about this approach. Airservices: Airservices does not currently have any other tools that it could use on weekends to provide notification of unplanned changes. We are in the process of adding mode information to WebTrak so communities can see what mode is being used.

Public Information and Reporting – Tailwind trial

Period	Question	Answer
Before AAB Meeting 10 (19 November 2025)	At the last AAB Meeting the BAC Representative gave us an update on an upcoming announcement of a tail wind trial. I was under the impression an announcement was imminent, but to date nothing has eventuated. This is a topic that is constantly coming up on my social media connections. Could you please ask BAC for an update and advise as soon as possible.	BAC: BAC will advise the AAB as soon as possible on the next steps. BAC published information on a voluntary 18 month tailwind data trial on 1 December 2025.

Technical Operations

Technical Operations – Airservices Staffing

Period	Question	Answer
Before AAB Meeting 9 (27 August 2025)	How have staffing levels had an impact on current and future operations of Brisbane Airport and Basin?	Airservices: Assuming that this question is specific to Air Traffic Control: Airservices Australia has key resilience and staffing measures in place to ensure our safe, secure, efficient and environmentally responsible services to the aviation industry. We are continuing to invest in our workforce across Australia to improve resilience, recruiting 109 controllers last year with a further 85 expected to be endorsed in 2025. We now have more than 1000 air traffic controllers which is sufficient to meet our operational roster requirements. We continue to recruit to improve service resilience including standby staff in some key locations.

Technical Operations – Divergence from Standard Instrument Departures (SIDs)

Period	Question	Answer
Before AAB Meeting 6 (20 November 2024)	<i>A lot of work has been done and is being done on aircraft flight paths. This is all for nought if aircraft do not follow SIDs (Standard Instrument Departures) when they can. There are dozens of examples of radar plots of departures to the south for northbound aircraft which do not follow the appropriate SID. The examples are on clear days, unaffected by weather, and other traffic. The paths appear to be “shortcuts”. The radar plots can be provided before the meeting if requested or I can have them with me on the day.</i> What percentage of aircraft do not follow SIDs, or are taken off SIDs by ATC (Air Traffic Control)? Can Airservices make available to residents/public, the reason for deviation from SIDs for each instance?	Airservices: There are a range of reasons aircraft will be taken off a SID, including to manage a conflicting operation (e.g. Emergency services aircraft transiting through the area), to avoid bad weather (i.e. a storm cell along the trajectory of the SID), to better sequence departures (e.g. to get a slower aircraft out of the path of a faster). This was discussed further in AAB Meeting 7, as noted in the Minutes.

Period	Question	Answer
Before AAB Meeting 8 (22 May 2025)	Please provide a report on exceptions for Noise Abatement Procedures (NAP) regarding requests for cancellation of SID procedures due to an inability to meet published climb gradients and/or speed requirements, and how to reduce this.	Airservices: Similar requests have also been made and responded to through BACACG and we have developed reporting to AAB on SID tracking adherence (provided in Meeting 7). The relevant NAP states “Jet aircraft will normally be assigned a procedural SID.” Adherence to this NAP is reported on Aircraft in Your Neighbourhood (a Brisbane-area location is required for Brisbane Airport NAP reporting to be displayed). We do not record reasons for pilots requesting alternative clearance (i.e. radar instead of procedural SID), as the pilot is ultimately responsible for the safe and efficient operation of the aircraft. We can provide data on the percentage of departures that meet the climb gradient for each procedural SID and the average climb gradient for those SIDs. We have provided some of this data previously to Senate Estimates, showing all narrow-body aircraft have historically easily exceeded minimum climb gradients for all SIDs out of Brisbane (i.e. 0 per cent did not meet the climb gradient). We have now also reviewed data for A380s, analysing 280 departures from 2024. All flights were above the minimum 3.3 per cent safety climb gradient, which is the first climb gradient specified on departure. Most A380s did not meet the next climb gradient on the WACKO and BIXAD SIDs; however, more than 50 per cent of these met the altitude requirements for the TOGIN waypoint (on the south-west flank of Mt Coot-Tha). There are no minimum speed requirements in procedural SIDs. The only speed references are for maximum speeds before specified waypoints for each departure.
Before AAB Meeting 11 (18 March 2026)	Is there a reason that the identified Qatar Airlines Brisbane to Doha flights at 10:00 PM on Monday 8 December and Thursday 11 December 2025 would have diverged from the SID?	Airservices: We are advised that on both Monday and Thursday these departures were taken off SID at pilot request. As previously advised, we don’t ask pilots for reasons when they request to be taken off SID; however, on both of these occasions we can report that it was due to weather. We strongly recommend that AAB members (and members of the public) direct this kind of query to the NCIS as they have access to more systems than the Community Engagement team does and can investigate directly, usually more quickly than the Community Engagement Team can.
Before AAB Meeting 11 (18 March 2026)	What steps are Airservices taking to encourage aircraft to adhere to the SID?	Airservices: Regarding SID adherence, this is something that has been discussed extensively in AAB meetings; we have investigated and reported on it several times. In response to the concerns raised by AAB, we instituted the instruction to Air Traffic Control to maintain departures on SID to 20,000ft. Again, we cannot compel pilots to follow a SID if they choose to decline it.

Period	Question	Answer
Before AAB Meeting 12 (24 June 2026)	Why is there still a wide area of track dispersion for jet aircraft on this departure path (over water departure to the south), which often results in a track shortening and thus much lower aircraft? (with the accompanying high noise disturbance).	Airservices: The dispersion of aircraft tracking and lower altitude crossings of the coast are mostly non-jet aircraft, as per previous information provided to the AAB. Dispersion of jet aircraft tracking can also occur, most commonly due to weather, to separate from other aircraft, or at pilot' request. As advised previously to the AAB, we are currently working on a minor redesign of over-water departure path from the eastern runway to enable more aircraft to accept this departure and track more closely along it. Airservices notes that jet aircraft are crossing the mainland Redlands coastline further south and higher in altitude than before changes introduced through the Noise Action Plan for Brisbane and also in comparison with air traffic prior to the opening of the western runway.

Technical Operations – Legacy Runway

Period	Question	Answer
Before AAB Meeting 7 (26 February 2025)	Why are flights not adhering to Noise Abatement Procedure that says that all arrivals must be aligned with the Legacy Instrument Landing System F(ILS) between 10PM and 6AM below 3000 feet?	Airservices: The referenced Noise Abatement Procedure reads: <i>From 2200-600 (10pm to 6am) Local, all aircraft shall not decent below 3000 ft until aligned with 01R centreline."</i> This means the RNP-ARs (Required Navigation Performance – Authorisation Required) can't be used during these hours. This is due to similar pre-New Parallel Runway Noise Abatement Procedures and to avoid overflight of communities closer to the airport at lower altitudes (i.e. high noise levels).

Period	Question	Answer
Before AAB Meeting 7 (26 February 2025)	Can you please advise (apart from turbo props) why not all aircraft when departing from the Legacy Runway over water are not adhering to the new SIDs (Standard Instrument Departures) introduced on the 28 November 2024? I am told from Community members that this was mainly occurring on weekends.	Airservices: We understand the time in question is the days just following the introduction of the new flight paths. We can see from aircraft tracking data that they were well adhered to in the first couple of days but then less so from the afternoon of Sunday 1 December. The immediate issue on Sunday was storms, which I think most people could see for themselves. However, we also were not able to use the new SIDs for a few days into the following week, which did raise quite a few questions from the community. We inquired further at the time and can advise that the continued non-adherence to the new departure paths was also due to weather. The weather system that pushed through over the weekend continued to affect operations on Monday as there were still storm cells observed and forecast over Moreton Bay. This necessitated multiple runway changes for individual aircraft and tactical intervention from Air Traffic Control (ATC) (i.e. they had to direct each plane not just give them a SID to follow). Pilots also requested alternative tracking to remain clear of weather. In communicating back to community members who inquire with you, it may be worth noting that the Bureau of Meteorology radar that most people look at for weather only shows rainfall. As you know, ATC and pilots also look at other aspects of weather, such as windshear, and have additional sources for weather forecasts and observations.

Technical Operations – Northerly Arrivals

Period	Question	Answer
Before AAB Meeting #11 (18 March 2026)	<i>Enclosed is 2023 Northerly Arrivals marked with a flight path commonly known to the community as Morbi. This path commonly took aircraft from the north and north east. As you can see in the 2024 Northerly Arrivals map, Morbi has disappeared and now a more direct path as marked has appeared. The communities towards Ashgrove, The Gap and Brookfield continuously complain they are impacted by this direct flight path to the long and short approach to Brisbane Airport without being advised of any flight path changes.</i> Can Airservices please explain how this change in flight path and or procedure has occurred?	Airservices: There is a secondary MORBI STAR. The main MORBI STAR is a procedural arrival path that aircraft will fly consistently from waypoint MORBI all the way to final approach. This is published here. The secondary STAR is procedural from waypoint MORBI to waypoint DAYBO (near Upper Caboolture) and is then managed tactically using compass heading direction from DAYBO to final approach. This secondary MORBI STAR is used for sequencing of traffic when there are multiple arrivals coming in at the same time. This is published here. Both paths have been available for use from the opening of the new runway in 2020. There has not been any change in flight path or procedure.

Technical Operations – Operating Restrictions

Period	Question	Answer
Before AAB Meeting 8 (22 May 2025)	In its submission to the recent Senate Inquiry into Mitigation and Impact of Aircraft Noise, Brisbane Airport Corporation included the following Airport Level recommendation: “Consider the introduction of voluntary overnight noise quotas and transparent reporting”. Is BAC considering proceeding with this recommendation?	BAC: BAC supports the investigation of night-time operating restrictions to evaluate whether they result in a meaningful reduction of noise impact. BAC has reviewed different types of restrictions from different airports internationally, and is continuing to develop potential methodologies for consideration at Australian airports. BAC has engaged Casper Aero, an aviation noise reporting company, to develop a suite of reporting metrics that will be provided to the community. These should be available by around the end of October 2025.
Before AAB Meeting 8 (22 May 2025)	Please provide a report on the number of flights that do not meet the new Chapter 14 Noise Standard of the ICAO Balanced Approach to Aircraft Noise Management (Stage 5).	BAC: The following aircraft types that operate at Brisbane Airport are compliant with the Chapter 14 noise standards: • Airbus A320/A321 NEO • Airbus A220 • Airbus A350 • Airbus A330 NEO • Airbus A380 • Boeing 787 – all variants • Boeing 737 Max 8 • Fokker F70 . In a sample week (31 March – 06 April) there were: • Total movements: 4256 • Chapter 14 movements: 651. Approximately 85 per cent of total movements do not meet Chapter 14 standards.

Period	Question	Answer
Before AAB Meeting 8 (22 May 2025)	What are Airservices' and BAC's views on restricting night time aircraft unless they meet the new Chapter 14 Noise Standard of the ICAO Balanced Approach to Aircraft Noise Management (Stage 5)?	BAC: There are a number of issues that would need to be considered before any restrictions could be imposed. The list below captures some of the issues that would require consideration. The 2200 hour and the 0500 hour contain a significant number of domestic flights that are not Chapter 14 complaint. Restricting those would have a significant effect on national connectivity – e.g. it would make it very difficult for business travellers to make effective day trips to Melbourne or Sydney, particularly during daylight saving periods. Because the fleets of the major domestic carriers are predominately non-compliant, late running flights that had been disrupted by weather or other schedule delays would not be able to arrive. This would likely result in significant disruption to large numbers of passengers. Both Virgin and the Qantas group have fleet replacement programs that will upgrade to Chapter 14 compliant aircraft over the next 8 years. Once those new fleets are large enough then imposing a restriction on those hours would be feasible, without significant schedule impact. In the 2300 hour there are few passenger aircraft operations. It may be feasible to move those forward into the 2200 hour, or some airlines may be able to replace their aircraft with Chapter 14 compliant aircraft – e.g. Qatar could potentially operate an A350 rather than the B777. Between 0000 and 0500 all current passenger aircraft are Chapter 14 complaint (A350 and A380 aircraft). Imposing a restriction would reduce the flexibility of airlines to change those aircraft if needed – e.g. Emirates may wish to replace a service with a B777, if the A380 was unserviceable on a particular day. If a restriction was in place, that service could not operate. There are currently no Chapter 14 compliant narrow-body freighters available in the world, meaning any restriction would prohibit freight distribution through Brisbane Airport. This could significantly affect freight into and out of Queensland - flights operate to Townsville, Cairns and Rockhampton each weeknight. Night-time restrictions are feasible, but would have impacts on connectivity and freight. A staged introduction of restrictions to align with airline fleet replacement plans is more feasible but does not resolve the freight issue.

Technical Operations – Systems Upgrades

Period	Question	Answer
Before AAB Meeting #9 (27 August 2025)	Please provide an update on the OneSKY Software project.	Airservices: The OneSKY Program remains the cornerstone of our commitment to delivering safe, world-class air traffic management services and we are working closely with the Department of Defence to deliver a harmonised civil military air traffic management system for the first time in Australia. OneSKY is expected to deliver \$2.7 billion of economic benefits over 20 years, including fuel savings, reduced carbon emissions and optimised operations. When OneSKY commences in 2027, it will be the most advanced air traffic management system in the world and the first new ATM system in Australia since the 1990s.

Technical Operations – Use of RPN-AR (Required Navigation Performance – Authorisation Required)

Period	Question	Answer
Before AAB Meeting 6 (20 November 2024)	Use of RNP-AR: <i>New Farm/Teneriffe residents are caught in the V between the Instrument Landing System path and the RNP-AR (Required Navigation Performance -Authorisation Required) path. There are often 15 hours continuous arrivals using these two flight paths, which are low altitude with no noise relief. It also impacts residents across the river at Bulimba. In the last phase of engagement by Trax on behalf of Airservices, Set 2 concept 3 (refer Set 2, Concept 3 Factsheet) had a proposal for arrivals over land from the north and west via the new runway:</i> <i>3.1(p): Introduce advanced Required Navigation Performance-Approval Required (RNP- AR) approaches for certified non-jet aircraft. RNP-AR refers to a high-precision arrival path that joins the final approach closer to the runway, using satellite navigation, onboard avionics and specialist pilot training.</i> - Can Airservices please provide the data of the number of planes using RNP-AR arrival over the period 2020 to 2024, broken down by jet and non-jet? - Does this data show an increase of the use of this 'short cut' by airlines, and if so why? - How is the choice to allocate this route made? - Is noise a factor that is considered when choosing the route?	Airservices: For the period 1 July 2023 to 30 June 2024, RNP-AR use to the new runway over land (runway 01L) was approximately 1340 movements. This compares to around 21,000 movements on other approaches to this runway. The RNP-AR operates at approximately 6 percent of arrival operations to the new runway. Airservices: The use of RNP-AR procedures is likely to increase over time as more aircraft and crew are endorsed to use it. During peak traffic periods however, it is more likely that the ILS will be used as this is simpler for air traffic control from an aircraft sequencing perspective. Airservices: Aircraft must be equipped and certified to fly this procedure, so this is the main decision factor, but the volume of aircraft arriving is also a factor. Airservices: No. Air traffic controllers are trained to operate airspace according to the required rules. They will apply noise abatement procedures as published but do not consider noise more generally when directing aircraft. Airservices: This is not considered from an operational decision making perspective. Airservices: BAC's Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) assessed the impact of increasing traffic volumes over time across Greater Brisbane. It did not cover the RNP-AR, as this technology was not available at the time of the EIS. Airservices Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) noted the introduction of the RNP-AR but did not specifically address growth in its use over time. Airservices: We have conducted temporary noise monitoring to capture noise data for this and a number of other flight paths. The noise monitor at Brisbane Powerhouse does not capture this as evidenced by Airservices response to comment 130 in the Brisbane Airport New Parallel Runway Post Implementation Review - Draft PIR Report - Response to Feedback effective 21 December 2022 produced by Airservices Australia (refer page 32).

Period	Question	Answer
	5. Is the cumulative impact of residents receiving RNP-AR paths followed by ILS paths a few minutes later considered?	
	6. Has the impact on residents of the increasing use of the RNP-AR been studied?	
	7. How is noise on the RNP-AR path measured?	
	8. Has Airservices done any work done to address this noise monitor issue to properly capture the noise metrics at New Farm, particularly as the aircraft go around the curve of the RNP-AR path?	8. Airservices: We have an ongoing temporary noise monitoring program. Hawthorne, which is subject to the RNP-AR flight path operations, has a temporary noise monitor. Once we have confirmed the final operations post delivery of all Noise Action Plan elements, the location of noise monitors will be reviewed and updated in consultation with the community.
	9. Why are non-jet aircraft already using this path when this was a concept only and another round of consultation is still to go? There are numerous Qantas Dash 8 planes using this route daily.	9. Airservices: The RNP-AR procedure is aligned with a visual approach procedure which is often used by non-jet aircraft. Qantas is fitting out their Dash-8 fleet to be RNP-AR capable and is increasing their use of RNP-AR procedures.
	10. Are more planes having equipment installed and pilots now being trained to use the RNP-AR path?	10. Airservices: Yes, for example, Qantas is fitting out their Dash-8 fleet to be RNP-AR capable.
	11. If there has been an increase in the use of RNP-AR why have impacted residents not been notified of the change, given that the consultation period still has another phase. Will residents be consulted as the RNP-AR flight numbers continue to grow?	11. Airservices: There has been no change in the RNP-AR flight path design or use generated by the Noise Action Plan for Brisbane. The BAC EIS accounted for the growth of air traffic over time and this growth is part of the project approval. Airservices has spoken often to the forecast for increased aircraft movement numbers over time. This is a trend across the country and most airports.

Technical Operations – Use of Segregated mode

Period	Question	Answer
Before AAB Meeting 8 (22 May 2025)	Why is segregated mode being used more often, and resulting in the New Parallel Runway taking all arrivals?	Segregated mode is used only where conditions require. It is not a preferred operating mode but is available to manage reduced airport capacity due to runway and taxiway works, runway outages due to disabled aircraft, during periods of poor weather, or when staffing does not enable full airspace operations. Segregated mode was used immediately after Ex-Tropical Cyclone Alfred due to a taxiway to the legacy runway being damaged. Due to the location of the damage and the section of the legacy runway that was not accessible, the segregated mode that has over land operations over new runway communities was used. When selecting one of the four segregated mode options (since the introduction of two new modes following engagement last year) wind direction is the first factor considered, which narrows the selection to two possible modes. Then the specific operational factors are considered – the matter causing the capacity reduction, time of day, traffic patterns etc. It is expected that over a full year, the use of the modes will balance impacts across both runway communities.