

Brisbane Airport Community Airspace Advisory Board (AAB)

Meeting Minutes

DATE	LOCATION
24 June 2026	Brisbane Airport Conference Centre – Pullman Hotel
MEETING TITLE: Brisbane Airport Community Airspace Advisory Board Meeting 12	
MEETING TIME: START TIME – 12.00 END TIME – 15:30	

Attendees

Name	Position
Kim Jordan	Chair – Brisbane Airport Community Airspace Advisory Board (AAB)
Tess Bignell	Community Representative
Stephen Muller	Community Representative
Janelle Moody	Community Representative
Matthew Loveday	Community Representative
Vanessa Taveras-Dalmau	Community Representative
Jacqui O’Dea	Airservices Australia – Chief Risk, Noise and Environment Officer
Donna Marshall	Airservices Australia – Head of Community Engagement
Marion Lawie	Airservices Australia – Community Engagement Senior Advisor
Tim Boyle	Brisbane Airport Corporation – Head of Airspace Management
Andrew Marshall	Director, Airports Branch, Domestic Aviation and Reform, Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development, Communications, Sport and the Arts (DITRDCA)
Rachel Lee	Secretariat, DITRDCA
Tara Ironside	Secretariat, DITRDCA

Apologies

- Sarah Nattey – DITRDCA
- Alex Tikoft – Airservices Australia – Head of Airspace and Aerodrome Services – Brisbane
- Luke Van Dongen – Virgin Australia – Base Manager
- David McCutcheon – Qantas Freight – Deputy Chief Pilot

Key matters and concerns raised by Community Representatives

NOTE: This section briefly sets out key matters and concerns raised by Community Representatives during the meeting. Further details, including any responses provided, are included in the Minutes below.

Delays, uncertainty and consultation fatigue

Community Representatives repeatedly raised concerns that delays in finalising and communicating outcomes from the Noise Action Plan for Brisbane (particularly Package 3) were increasing frustration, prolonging uncertainty for residents and reducing confidence in engagement processes.

Need for clear and transparent communication on Package 3 outcomes and decision-making

Community Representatives expressed a need for clear and transparent communication on decision-making in relation to Package 3 outcomes, including understanding the role of the Minister, and Airservices' Executive Steering Group (including providing detail of its membership). Community Representatives raised concerns around how technical decisions were made, particularly decisions not to proceed with previously identified options, and how these would be communicated to the public.

The importance of lived experience and concerns with noise and complaint metrics

Community Representatives emphasised that reduced complaint numbers did not mean that community concern around aircraft noise impacts had reduced. Community Representatives also expressed concern that annual averages did not reflect lived experience and that existing quantitative metrics do not always adequately capture cumulative impacts, concentration of operations, seasonal variation or the day-to-day experiences of affected communities.

Noise Complaint and Information Service (NCIS) complaint processes

Community Representatives raised concerns about Airservices Australia's NCIS, including community members experiencing difficulty in identifying which complaint a response relates to, and concern that some community members did not receive responses to each of their complaints.

Concern that flight path changes to facilitate SODPROPS had not provided the relief expected

Some Community Representatives repeated concerns about aircraft not consistently following standard instrument departures (SID) when departing over the ocean from the western runway, but turning around to travel over land, and apparent instances of shortcutting, resulting in aircraft being at low altitudes when back over land, with noise impacts on communities in the Redlands.

Noise monitoring, modelling and reporting

Some Community Representatives raised concern around noise monitor coverage and locations, transparency of monitoring data, separate noise monitoring systems, and WebTrak functionality. Community Representatives noted that communities often place greater trust in monitor data than models and queried the location, number and technology used for noise monitors.

Future mitigation and respite options being considered in Package 4

Community Representatives queried what practical relief may be available for communities under departure paths, including through Package 4, such as segregated operations, or respite modes.

Broader policy and planning matters

Community Representatives expressed disappointment that the Brisbane Airport Master Plan 2026 was approved while outcomes from the Noise Action Plan for Brisbane remained undecided and requested information on changes between the draft and final plan, particularly those relevant to noise outcomes. Community Representatives noted the importance of timely communication of significant aviation policy and regulatory developments relevant to aircraft noise from the Department and Airservices so that Community Representatives could let their communities know and participate in any review processes.

Minutes

Agenda Item 1: Welcome and Acknowledgement of Country

The Chair, Kim Jordan, opened the meeting at 12:10 and welcomed members and industry advisors. She acknowledged the traditional Custodians of the land on which Brisbane Airport is located, the Turrbal people, and paid respects to Elders past and present. She also acknowledged Traditional Owners across Australia.

Agenda Item 2: Administration

The Chair introduced the meeting.

Apologies were received from Sarah Nattey, Alex Tikoft, Luke Van Dongen and David McCutcheon.

Andrew Marshall attended the meeting virtually as the DITRDCSA representative.

Administration

- Kim welcomed attendees and encouraged them to introduce themselves to the newly appointed Community Representative, Vanessa Taveras-Dalmau.
- Other Community Representatives introduced themselves, noting which areas they represented, but emphasised that while they may represent specific areas, the role of Community Representatives was broader, and intended to represent community interests as a whole.
- Vanessa then introduced herself, noting she has around 15 years of experience in community engagement across environmental sustainability, climate action, and social impact. Vanessa shared that she was interested in the role due to her engagement with aviation noise issues and the impact of proposed flight path changes.
- Kim noted that Vanessa's background in engagement, communications and marketing was a strength that would complement existing skillsets amongst Community Representatives.

Timing of Package 3 Announcement

- Kim invited Airservices Australia (Airservices) to provide an update on Package 3 of the Noise Action Plan for Brisbane, noting that the meeting date had been changed to allow outcomes to be presented to the group.
 - Jacqui O'Dea advised that Airservices had made its final decisions on outcomes for Package 3 of the Noise Action Plan for Brisbane. However, following consultation with the Office of the Hon Catherine King MP, Minister for Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Communication, Airservices had delayed release by approximately two weeks to give the Minister sufficient time to understand its decisions prior to their announcement.
 - Community Representatives expressed significant disappointment and frustration regarding the delay in announcement, noting ongoing uncertainty for and impact on residents affected by aircraft noise.
 - Community Representatives emphasised that the prolonged delay in finalising Package 3 outcomes was contributing to community frustration, consultation fatigue and declining confidence in the process.
 - Community Representatives also noted that some residents continued to delay personal and family decisions pending greater certainty regarding future aircraft noise outcomes.
 - Airservices clarified that recommendations for flight path changes are developed by subject matter experts within Airservices, then reviewed and ultimately decided by an internal executive steering group within Airservices. Airservices strongly emphasised that the Minister is not the decision maker in relation to flight path changes.
 - Community Representatives questioned the role of the Minister's Office in the release process and expressed concern that affected communities (and Community Representatives) have limited opportunities to directly communicate the lived impacts of aircraft noise and the impacts of prolonged
-

uncertainty to the Minister. Community Representatives also sought greater transparency regarding the release process and associated timelines.

- Airservices noted that, in briefing the Minister's Office on Package 3 outcomes, it had provided detailed context on community impacts and feedback to reflect the human experience and committed to continuing to convey Community Representative concerns in relation to the timing of the announcement, the impact of the delay and the strength of community sentiment.
- A Community Representative asked Airservices what next steps would be, and whether the Minister could disagree with Airservices' decision.
- Airservices again emphasised that it was Airservices, rather than the Minister, that was the decision-maker in relation to flight path changes, but the Ministers' Office may request additional information to support understanding the decision before it is announced.
- Airservices advised that they would still brief Community Representatives ahead of public release, and that the announcement would be followed by publication of final consultation reports, with a 4-week engagement period for feedback and queries (noting these will not change the decision), before finalisation and implementation.
- Kim noted that the briefing session should be held face to face where possible and include appropriate technical representation from Airservices to answer questions from the Community Representatives.
- Community Representatives commented that inconsistent use of old and new language in relation to runways at Brisbane Airport was confusing.
- Airservices noted it was using both old and new language in relation to the runways for consistency with engagement materials used in earlier phases of the Noise Action Plan for Brisbane.

Other administrative matters

The group then discussed the role of Community Aviation Consultation Groups (CACGs) including the Brisbane Airport Community Aviation Consultation Group (BACACG):

- The group noted that these forums address a broader range of airport-related matters, whereas the AAB provides more detailed discussions with a specific focus on aircraft noise issues.
- The group discussed opportunities to improve communication and information sharing between BACACG and AAB representatives including exchange of contact details between Community Representatives, improved visibility of matters discussed in each forum and opportunities for stronger collaboration on issues of common interest. It was noted that the AAB's focus is aircraft noise matters, however BACACG minutes indicate that some presentations and discussions at BACACG meetings relating to aircraft noise had not been made to the AAB.
- Kim noted that she would contact the BACACG Chair, Mr Nigel Chamier AM, to obtain Community Representative details and explore opportunities for future engagement.

The group then discussed presentation of noise complaints data to the aviation industry:

- A Community Representatives expressed concern at presentation of NCIS complaints figures in reporting provided to the aviation industry, which showed that complaint numbers relating to Brisbane had decreased.
- Community Representatives noted that reductions in complaint numbers do not necessarily indicate reduced community frustration, reduced aircraft noise impacts or increased acceptance of aircraft noise. Community Representatives observed that inability to lodge with NCIS, complaint fatigue, reduced confidence in complaint processes and competing personal circumstances may influence complaint numbers over time, and they are therefore not a good performance indicator.
- Airservices emphasised that they did not ascribe any meaning to complaint numbers going down for this reason.
- Community Representatives and the Chair emphasised that there would be value in reflecting lived experience and qualitative information when communicating aircraft noise impacts to industry (rather than just numbers of complaints).
- Community Representatives expressed concern that complaint numbers alone do not adequately communicate the lived impacts of aircraft noise and supported the inclusion of qualitative information when communicating community impacts to industry stakeholders.

Actions

1. Airservices to hold out-of-session briefing with Community Representatives on Package 3 outcomes ahead of public release (with Secretariat to support in organisation).
2. Chair to contact the BACACG Chair to organise exchange of contact details between BACACG Community Representatives and AAB Community Representatives.

Agenda Item 3: Action items

The Action Items list is at Attachment A.

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

- For **Action Item 1.1**, it was noted that the item would continue to remain open pending further information, including Package 3 outcomes and route growth forecasts from BAC.
- For **Action Item 3.4 and Action Item 3.8**, the items would remain open and be revisited when Package 3 of the Noise Action Plan for Brisbane is released.
 - The group agreed that Secretariat would recirculate meeting summary from Think Research briefing on aircraft noise metrics (held in September 2025) to Community Representatives, including Vanessa, with the item to remain open, and any feedback to be shared with Airservices.
 - Community Representative reiterated the importance of metrics that reflect lived experience and noted concerns that existing quantitative metrics do not always adequately capture cumulative impacts, concentration of operations, seasonal variation or the day-to-day experiences of affected communities.
 - Tess Bignell noted she had provided feedback for Airservices to the Secretariat.
 - Airservices noted that its current assessment criteria include quantitative measures such as population overflown, people affected at 60 dB and 70 dB, newly overflown population, emissions, track miles, frequency of overflight, cumulative impacts and sensitive receptors.
 - The group discussed the challenges of balancing safety, industry, and community impacts, noting that decisions often involve trade-offs between communities and aim to achieve the fairest overall outcome, despite not being able to satisfy all areas or communities.
 - During this discussion, a Community Representative requested information on who participated in the executive steering group which decided flight path changes. Airservices agreed it would circulate this information. Community Representatives welcomed greater transparency regarding Airservices' governance arrangements and decision-making processes and requested further information regarding Executive Steering Group membership and decision pathways.
 - Airservices noted that it was exploring potential altitude-based approaches to better balance impacts and will share more information when it is able to do so.
 - Airservices noted that Think Research had found that its approach to considering aircraft noise metrics was generally consistent with other international examples.
 - Airservices emphasised that making flight path changes which would alter aircraft noise impacts on communities was not an easy decision.
- For **Action Item 11.1**, the Chair confirmed the out-of-session meeting with Community Representative had been held, and the item could be closed.

Actions

3. Airservices to provide further information on the membership of its executive steering group.

Agenda Item 4: Airservices Update

Airservices provided the presentation included as *Attachment B*.

Airservices action items

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

- For **Action Item 11.2**, Airservices presented the outcomes of their further exploration of approach to improving complain responses from the Noise Complaints and Information Service (NCIS).
 - Airservices noted that at present, responses provided do not include a copy of the original complaint or enquiry, and people need to match them themselves, but that it could start to have the original complaint included with the response (for written complaints).
 - Airservices explained that NCIS responses generally summarise the issue raised and provide a response, and that standard wording is sometimes used where similar questions are received, even if the response is tailored, noting that similar questions will have similar responses.
 - Community Representatives queried whether there was a limit on responses community members could receive.
 - Airservices noted that there is no limit on the number of complaints that can be made (and that 80 per cent of complaints were from around five people), however repeat complaints or enquiries about the same matter may not each receive a response to each repeated enquiry unless the answer has changed (i.e. new information is available).
 - Airservices noted that each of these complaints were still individually counted, and Airservices advises the complainant that they will not receive further replies to the same questions if the answer remained as previously advised.
 - Airservices noted that it had recently provided information on procedures for responding to individuals raising the same issue repeatedly through the NCIS, in response to an enquiry from a Community Representative, and requested that the Secretariat circulate this information to other Community Representatives.
 - Community Representatives suggested that all Community Representatives on the Board be copied into enquiries to help ensure responses are shared across the group.
 - Community Representatives raised concerns that when a person regularly makes complaints or enquiries, they may not be able to easily identify which complaint a response relates to, particularly where only a summary of the complaint is included.
 - The group discussed whether NCIS responses could be improved so complainants can more clearly identify which complaint is being responded to, particularly where the response only summarises the issue raised. Airservices noted that the current system has limitations and that a new complaints and noise information system is being procured.
 - The Chair and Community Representatives noted it would be valuable to understand scope of the new system and potential improvements.
 - Airservices noted it would continue to consider opportunities to improve tracking of multiple complaints in NCIS responses, including whether the original complaint text could be included, attached or otherwise referenced.
 - Discussion then turned to public flight tracking systems, noting that the WebTrak platform used by Airservices works well, but is quite slow, and having the separate platform provided by BAC is useful for comparisons.
 - A Community Representative noted that BAC system would be more useful if it could present information that is more than 3 months old.
 - BAC noted that this functionality may be able to be changed, and that it would check.
 - For **Action 11.3**, the Group discussed the item, with the item to remain open until Airservices considered and responded to follow-on questions from Stephen Muller.
 - Some community representatives repeated concerns about aircraft not consistently following standard instrument departures (SID) when departing over the ocean from the western runway, but turning around to travel over land, and apparent instances of shortcutting, resulting in aircraft being at low altitudes when back over land, with noise impacts on communities in the Redlands.
-

-
- Airservices explained that departures may vary due to aircraft performance, fleet mix, weather, pilot requests, and air traffic control requirements to maintain safe separation.
 - A Community Representative raised concerns about aircraft deviating from the SID and the reasons for those deviations not being recorded.
 - Other Community Representatives noted that their primary concern was the resulting noise impacts and aircraft operating at lower altitudes when deviations occurred.
 - Airservices noted that pilots are not required to provide reasons for requests and controllers are not resourced to record them in all instances.
 - Airservices noted that aircraft following programmed SIDs track precisely within a level of tolerance, while those operating under tactical instructions following compass headings will show greater variation in flight paths and altitudes when returning over land.
 - Community Representatives emphasised that the key concern was that noise impacts were ongoing, and the introduction of the flight path changes for overwater departures to maximise use of SODPROPS had not met community expectations.
 - Discussion turned to whether similar performance issues could be expected for the early turn trial proposed as part of Package 3, which would impact on Wynnum and other Bayside communities.
 - Airservices acknowledged that with the flight path changes implemented in November 2024, there were issues with the design, making it difficult for some planes to stick to the SID, and Airservices was exploring options to address.
 - Airservices emphasised that the post-implementation review, ongoing noise monitoring and any trials that may be conducted were important mechanisms to compare forecast and actual outcomes and inform any adjustments that may be necessary.
 - Discussion turned to the early turn trial, and whose decision it would be to proceed with any longer-term implementation, in the event the trial was successful.
 - Brisbane Airport Corporation noted that it had initially written the associated Noise Abatement Procedure (NAP), which applied to evening flights, and had insisted it remained in place.
 - Airservices and BAC noted that any decision to vary the NAP, based on the outcome of the trial, would need to be negotiated.
 - BAC noted that the NAP reflected a voluntary mode and was not a condition associated with any approvals.
 - Community Representatives discussed the relationship between the Noise Abatement Procedure, proposed night-time operations and potential noise impacts for affected communities.
 - BAC noted that they did not anticipate significant growth in overnight flights but otherwise was concerned about the implications of any changes to the NAP.

Action Item 11.4 – Noise Action Plan for Brisbane – Implementation breakdown and linkages

- For **Action Item 11.4**, Airservices presented a working draft of interactive document showing break down and linkages of Noise Action Plan for Brisbane packages of work (included as *Attachment C*) and sought feedback from the group.
 - Airservices demonstrated a working draft version of the Noise Action Plan for Brisbane implementation breakdown and linkages document.
 - Community Representatives provided positive feedback, noting it would assist in navigating actions, packages, phases, and related information.
 - Airservices offered to provide some key feedback questions for circulation alongside the document to seek further feedback from Community Representatives.
 - The group agreed the item would remain open, with Community Representatives to review the provided material and any feedback to be provided back to Airservices via the Secretariat.

Other updates

Community Representatives identified timeliness of communication as an ongoing issue affecting community trust and confidence. Community Representatives noted examples where technical decisions or outcomes had not been communicated for extended periods after decisions had been made and emphasised the importance of timely communication of significant outcomes.

A Community Representative sought any updates on Package 4. In response:

- Airservices provided an update on Package 4, noting that Trax is undertaking safety and operational workshops with Airservices subject matter experts, with community engagement expected later in 2026, subject to further progress, but material was not ready to be shared.
- Airservices noted they had requested that Trax consider arrangements for multiple alternating departure routes, but it was not possible with current systems and did not appear to be a current practice anywhere in the world. Airservices noted that arrangements for multiple alternative arrival routes may be possible, but not arrangements for multiple alternative departure routes.
- Community Representatives queried what could give relief for communities under departure paths. Airservices noted that potential solutions included segregated operations and respite modes, which would be considered as part of Package 4, but that it was wary of raising community expectations.
- Airservices also highlighted the importance of managing Package 4 in an orderly way, with clear pathways and decision-making, and without creating unnecessary uncertainty for communities, after reviewing engagement on Package 3.

The group discussed resourcing required to analyse community feedback and progress future packages:

- The Chair noted that a substantial delay associated with finalising Package 3 was due to the work involved in analysing significant qualitative community feedback, and hoped resources would be more appropriate in future.
- Airservices noted it has reorganised internally to focus on Package 4, while continuing to manage work across other airports and airspace projects.

Actions

4. Secretariat to circulate Airservices' written advice regarding NCIS management plans and review processes to all Community Representatives.
5. BAC to explore if their public flight path tracking system could be updated to provide more than 3 months of flight history, and report back to the group.

Agenda Item 5: Brisbane Airport Corporation update

BAC provided the presentation included as *Attachment D*.

Tailwind Safety Trial

- BAC provided an update on the tailwind trial, noting that participation is voluntary and that the data had been updated to 22 June 2026.
 - The group discussed the potential inclusion of total overnight departures in public reporting to provide additional context, with BAC agreeing to consider this.
 - BAC advised that the purpose of the trial was to gather additional industry data to support any future application to CASA to implement arrangements from the trial on a more permanent basis, noting that previous feedback from CASA highlighted there are sufficient air traffic control safeguards, but a need for stronger industry data inputs to inform the safety case.
 - The group discussed factors influencing airline participation in the tailwind trial, including operating procedures, pilot training, aircraft type, routes, and operational requirements.
-

- Community Representatives raised questions about late evening freight departures and whether timing could be managed to increase over-water operations where possible.
- BAC noted that participation in the tailwind trial is voluntary and subject to suitable operational conditions, and that in the specific example raised, it is likely the slot would not have been available.

Runway Works

- BAC provided an update on upcoming runway works, noting that the presentation could be circulated.
- The group discussed the nature and timing of the works, emphasising the need for clear public information on timing and impacts.

Annual Australian Noise Exposure Indices

- BAC led a discussion of the potential use of annual noise contours as a reporting tool, including an Australian Noise Exposure Index (developed in a manner consistent with an Australian Noise Exposure Forecast), and supplementary noise information.
- The group noted that the presented information was difficult to understand, with Community Representatives emphasising that annual averages did not necessarily reflect lived experience, particularly in relation to seasonal or wind-direction variations.
- BAC noted in light of this feedback, the contours did not seem valuable in their current form, and that it would undertake further work before returning it to the group at the next AAB meeting.

Other Updates

- BAC advised that the Brisbane Airport Master Plan 2026 has been approved, with publication expected within the statutory period, likely in July 2026.
- Community Representatives expressed disappointment that the plan was approved while outcomes from the Noise Action Plan for Brisbane remained undecided and requested information on changes between the draft and final plan, particularly those relevant to noise outcomes.
- BAC advised it would confirm whether this information would be published alongside the Master Plan.
- BAC provided updates on the operation of Middle Eastern carriers at Brisbane Airport, including the return or expected return of Emirates Airlines and Qatar Airlines services.
- BAC also noted that Western Sydney International Airport is expected to open in 2026, though potential impacts on Brisbane freight operations were not yet clear.

Actions

6. BAC to undertake further work on potential use of annual noise contours as a reporting tool, and present back to the group at the next AAB meeting.
7. 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.

Agenda Item 6: Community member issues – raised prior to meeting

Ms Janelle Moody – SODPROPS paper

Note: Due to time constraints, this item was not discussed during the meeting but has been included as Attachment E. Questions raised will be responded to out of session where they have not already been addressed.

Ms Janelle Moody – Noise Monitoring Paper

Janelle spoke to the paper, included as *Attachment F*.

Janelle highlighted concerns regarding monitor coverage, monitor locations and status, system integration, consistency of publicly available information, transparency of monitoring data, WebTrak functionality and community confidence in reported outcomes.

The group discussed the item:

- The group discussed the role of noise monitors and noise modelling.
- Airservices and BAC explained that models are used for forecasting and planning, while noise monitors are used to calibrate models and validate actual outcomes during post-implementation reviews.
- Community Representatives noted that communities often place greater trust in monitor data than models and queried the location, number and technology used for noise monitors.
- BAC noted that noise monitor data was used for calibration of the Australian Noise Exposure Forecast set out in the Brisbane Airport Master Plan, in that monitoring data was used to test how accurate the model used to generate the ANEF was. The outcome of this calibration process was a model that more accurately reflected data from noise monitors.
- Airservices advised that it is undertaking procurement for a new noise and flight path management system, with the aim of improving the community-user experience and integrating complaint handling, flight tracking and noise monitoring information.
- The group agreed that responses to matters raised in the paper, and the SODPROPS paper, would be incorporated into the out-of-session question and answer document for sharing with Community Representatives and publication on the AAB website.
- Community Representatives requested that responses to outstanding questions be provided in plain language where possible to assist understanding and facilitate further discussion.
- Community Representatives noted ongoing community confusion regarding the relationship between noise forecasting, modelling and monitoring systems and requested clearer plain-language explanations of how noise-monitoring data is used to calibrate models and validate outcomes. Representatives observed that public confidence in aircraft noise assessments is influenced by community understanding of these processes.
- Due to time constraints, the Group agreed that questions raised in the paper would be responded to out of session.

Discussion – Out of Session Items

The Chair noted that responses to issues raised prior to the meeting had been provided out of session, and sought any follow-up queries from Community Representatives:

- Community Representatives queried whether responses provided out of session could be shared more widely, and if they were published.
- The Chair and the Secretariat confirmed that responses could be shared unless Community Representatives were advised that material was confidential or not for further distribution, noting that the Secretariat published responses to out of session questions received and responded to between each meeting on the AAB website.
- A Community Representative expressed concern regarding the extended period between completion of investigations into a proposal to lower the cloud-ceiling requirement from 2500ft to 2000 feet and communication of that outcome to stakeholders (noting outcomes were known in September 2025, but not announced until March 2026). Community Representatives noted that delays in communicating decisions contribute to reduced trust and confidence in engagement processes and emphasised the importance of timely communication of outcomes, including where proposals are not proceeding. A Community Representative queried whether there was any relationship between the proposal to lower the cloud ceiling requirement and the tailwind safety trial being undertaken by BAC.
- Airservices clarified that the cloud-ceiling investigations and the tailwind trial were not related. The potential to lower the cloud-ceiling requirement is related to controller visibility requirements for simultaneous opposite direction parallel runway operations, whereas tailwind departures do not require the same visual separation and are therefore not subject to those requirements.
- Community Representatives expressed concern that mitigation measures may be publicly discussed for extended periods before being abandoned, with limited explanation of the analysis undertaken, alternatives considered or implications for overall noise mitigation outcomes.
- Community Representatives emphasised the importance of transparent communication regarding decisions not to proceed with proposed mitigation initiatives.

Actions

8. BAC and Airservices to consider matters raised in both of Ms Janelle Moody's papers, with responses to be incorporated into the out-of-session question and answer document for sharing with Community Representatives and publication on the AAB website.

Agenda Item 7: Other Business

The group discussed other business:

- A Community Representative raised concerns regarding recent Aircraft Noise Ombudsman reforms being considered in the Australian Parliament and expressed a view that noise-impacted communities had not been consulted regarding aircraft-noise-related aspects of those reforms.
- Community Representatives noted the importance of timely communication of significant aviation policy and regulatory developments relevant to aircraft noise from the Department and Airservices so that Community Representatives could let their communities know and participate in any review processes.
- A Community Representative raised questions regarding Queensland Government-funded aviation route-development and funding programs and queried whether community aircraft-noise impacts are considered alongside economic and aviation outcomes when such programs are developed or administered. It was noted that the identified program was run by the Queensland Government, and the matter may be more appropriately considered through another consultation forum.
- The group confirmed action items.
- The group confirmed availability for the out-of-session briefing session.
- Kim thanked members for their participation and closed the meeting at 15:30.

The next meeting is scheduled for 2 September 2026.

Open Action Items

No.	Meeting Date	Item	Requirement	Responsible Person	Completion Date	Status
1.1	18 May 2023	Route Growth Forecasts	AAB to work with Brisbane Airport Corporation (BAC) and Airservices on how to better provide information and data on expected aircraft movements, and previous and proposed impacts.	BAC Airservices	When possible	Updated provided at meeting #12. Airservices published 2024 figures for information alongside Phase 6 Consultation. BAC has not yet published route growth forecast maps. Item to remain open until maps are published.
3.4	22 November 2023	Independent Assurance	Chair and Donna Marshall to discuss scope of works for Airservices' independent technical advisor for quality assurance. Airservices to task independent technical advisor, Think, to develop a research paper exploring the best metrics to understand noise reduction (in terms of sharing, concentration, and mitigation), and looking at the positives and negatives for each metric.	Chair Airservices	Prior to next meeting	Update provided at meeting #12. Meeting summary and notes from Think Research briefing session of 10 September 2025 to be recirculated to Community Representatives, with share any feedback received with Airservices.
3.8	22 November 2023	Noise Action Plan Metrics	Industry representatives to update the AAB on any progress to develop metrics under the Noise Action Plan for Brisbane. Airservices to task independent technical advisor, Think, to develop a research paper exploring the best metrics to understand noise reduction (in terms of sharing, concentration, and mitigation), and looking at the positives and negatives for each metric.	Airservices BAC	Prior to next meeting	Update provided at meeting #12. Meeting summary and notes from Think Research briefing session of 10 September 2025 to be recirculated to Community Representatives, with share any feedback received with Airservices.

No.	Meeting Date	Item	Requirement	Responsible Person	Completion Date	Status
11.3	18 March 2026	Departures to the south during north winds	Airservices to consider and respond to matters raised by Stephen Muller, including consolidation of previous advice and responses.	Airservices	Prior to next meeting	Discussed during meeting #12. Item to remain open, noting that Stephen Muller has raised follow-up questions for Airservices' consideration via the Secretariat on 24 June 2026 and 17 July 2026
11.4	18 March 2026	Noise Action Plan for Brisbane – Implementation breakdown and linkages	Airservices to further consider best approach to linking between actions for the summary of <i>Noise Action Plan for Brisbane</i> implementation status update, and report back to the group.	Airservices	Prior to next meeting	Discussed during meeting #12. Item to remain open until Community Representatives have had an opportunity to review the circulated material and provide feedback. Airservices has provided framing questions to Secretariat for sharing with Community Representatives to guide feedback.
12.1	24 June 2026	Briefing session – Package 3 outcomes	Airservices to hold out-of-session briefing with Community Representatives on Package Three outcomes ahead of public release (with Secretariat to support in organisation).	Airservices	Prior to next meeting	New item
12.2	24 June 2026	BACACG Community Representative Engagement	Chair to contact the BACACG Chair to organise exchange of contact details between BACACG Community Representatives and AAB Community Representatives.	Chair	Prior to next meeting	New item
12.3	4 June 2026	Executive Steering Group Membership Information	Airservices to provide further information on the membership of its executive steering group.	Airservices	Prior to next meeting	New item

No.	Meeting Date	Item	Requirement	Responsible Person	Completion Date	Status
12.4	24 June 2026	NCIS management plans	Secretariat to circulate Airservices' written advice regarding NCIS management plans and review processes to all Community Representatives.	Secretariat	Prior to next meeting	New item
12.5	24 June 2026	Public Flight Path Tracking System	BAC to explore if public flight path tracking system could be updated to provide more than 3 months of flight history, and report back to the group	BAC	Prior to next meeting	New item
12.6	24 June 2026	Annual Noise Contour Reporting	BAC to undertake further work on potential use of annual noise contours as a reporting tool, and present back to the group at the next AAB meeting.	BAC	Next AAB meeting	New item
12.7	24 June 2026	Master Plan – summary of changes	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	Next AAB meeting	New item
12.8	24 June 2026	SODPROPS and Noise Monitoring matters	BAC and Airservices to consider matters raised in both of Ms Janelle Moody's papers, with responses to be incorporated into the out-of-session question and answer document for sharing with Community Representatives and publication on the AAB website.	Airservices BAC	Prior to next AAB meeting	New item

Closed Action Items

No.	Meeting Date	Item	Requirement	Responsible Person	Completion Date	Status
11.1	18 March 2026	Out-of-session meeting	Chair and Community Representatives to meet out of session before the end of April 2026 to discuss potential submission in relation to Fly Considerately Guidance, community metrics and KPIs, and factsheets and material on airplane performance and noise.	Chair Community Representatives	Before end of April 2026	Meeting held in April 2026. Item closed.
11.2	18 March 2026	NCIS complaint processes	Airservices to undertake further exploration of approaches to improving complaint responses.	Airservices	Prior to next meeting	Discussed during meeting #12. Item can be closed, noting Airservices is continuing to consider opportunities to improve NCIS systems.