

Brisbane Airport Community Airspace Advisory Board (AAB)

Meeting Minutes

DATE	LOCATION
2 September 2026	Brisbane Airport Conference Centre – Pullman Hotel
MEETING TITLE: Brisbane Airport Community Airspace Advisory Board Meeting 13	
MEETING TIME: START TIME – 12.30	END TIME – 15:20

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
Luke Van Dongen	Virgin Australia – Base Manager
Rachel Parry	Deputy Secretary, Transport Group, Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development, Communications, Sports and The Arts (DITRDCA)
Jen Stace	First Assistant Secretary, Domestic Aviation and Reform, DITRDCA
Sarah Nattey	Assistant Secretary, Airports Branch, DITRDCA
Rachel Lee	Secretariat, DITRDCA
Tara Ironside	Secretariat, DITRDCA

Apologies

Richard Foley-Lewis – Airservices Australia

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.

Governance and community input in decision-making

Community Representatives questioned how community feedback and local knowledge were considered through Airservices' governance and flight-path decision-making processes. Community Representatives queried the assurance role of the department, how community input was considered in final decisions, and the adequacy of escalation pathways where they considered there were significant concerns.

Noise sharing, reduced concentration and Package 3 outcomes

Community Representatives expressed strong dissatisfaction that Package 3 of the Noise Action Plan for Brisbane had not delivered a meaningful reduction in concentration or practical relief for some mainland Brisbane communities, and questioned the consistency between its stated objectives to reduce frequency and concentration of flights over communities, and the outcomes it ultimately delivered. Community Representatives also sought clearer communication about the distinction between flight-path changes, shifting aircraft noise between communities and providing respite through different operating modes.

Respite measures and operational capacity

Community Representatives expressed concern around the practical availability and effectiveness of respite and noise-sharing modes, which were likely to diminish as airport traffic and capacity requirements increased. Community Representatives requested that Package 4 material clearly explain the conditions in which proposed modes could operate, and any associated limitations, such as frequency of use, and how future traffic growth could affect the benefit delivered to communities.

Metrics and evidence for assessing options and impacts

Community Representatives sought greater transparency about the evidence, metrics and criteria used to assess flight-path options and aircraft-noise impacts. Representatives queried how metrics such as annual average noise contours, seasonal conditions, and community experience contributed to final decisions.

Noise monitoring

Community Representatives sought clearer information about noise-monitor locations, the availability of historical monitoring data and the relationship between separate monitoring undertaken by Airservices and Brisbane Airport Corporation.

Aircraft movements outside published flight paths

Community Representatives raised concerns about aircraft movements outside published flight procedures, including movements recorded as pilot requests and the operational circumstances that may result in an aircraft departing from a published procedure.

Flight-path design and aircraft operations

Community Representatives sought clearer information about how flight-path design and operational practices affect aircraft movements and noise over communities. Discussion included climb profiles, noise-abatement departure procedures and the extent to which pilots and airlines could reduce noise within existing safety and operational requirements.

Broader aircraft-noise management measures

Community Representatives discussed broader aircraft-noise management measures, including full-length departures, airline scheduling, operating modes, noise-abatement procedures, night-time operations and noise insulation, and sought greater leadership on measure requiring policy, regulatory or industry action beyond the direct remit of Airservices, Brisbane Airport Corporation and the AAB.

Minutes

Agenda Item 1: Welcome and Acknowledgement of Country

The Chair, Kim Jordan, opened the meeting at 12:30 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

Luke Van Dongen attended the meeting virtually.

Apologies were received from Richard Foley-Lewis and David McCutcheon. While Ruth Moody from Brisbane Airport Corporation had been expecting to attend as an additional attendee, she was unavailable.

- Kim welcomed Rachel Parry, Deputy Secretary, Transport Group, Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development, Communications, Sport and the Arts (the department), and Jen Stace, First Assistant Secretary, Domestic Aviation and Reform, and invited them to introduce themselves and provide an overview of the Brisbane aircraft noise site tour undertaken on 1 September 2026.

Departmental representative introductions and aircraft noise site tour

- Rachel advised she had been Deputy Secretary of the Transport Group for approximately six months, following senior executive roles in transport-adjacent policy areas. She noted that the early part of her role had been heavily focused on the fuel crisis and that she was now seeking to spend more time meeting aviation stakeholders and understanding issues on the ground.
 - Rachel noted that she had met with stakeholders from Melbourne, Sydney, Gold Coast and Brisbane airports to better understand the key issues affecting each location.
 - Rachel indicated that her purpose in attending the AAB was to listen and better understand the issues being raised by the group and the communities represented.
 - The department advised that the Brisbane aircraft noise site tour included locations across Bulimba, Morningside, Woolloongabba and New Farm. The group spent time outdoors during the afternoon, observing aircraft movements, flight paths and altitudes, as well as the surrounding residential environment.
 - A Community Representative noted that a short site visit can provide an initial sense of aircraft noise but that the experience varies with wind, traffic and other operating conditions.
 - A Community Representative further emphasised that, while they were appreciative of departmental representatives making the effort to undertake the tour, a site visit should not be necessary to appreciate the seriousness of aircraft noise impacts, with Brisbane residents under flight paths being exposed to noise events exceeding 70 decibels at night, and queried why this level of noise exposure was acceptable, when other forms of disruptive noise exposure have community protections.
 - The department acknowledged that the tour was a brief initial impression and was not equivalent to living with aircraft operations over an extended period.
 - A Community Representative noted that Brisbane housing types and density can influence how aircraft noise is experienced, while another Community Representative highlighted seasonal differences, including summer conditions, time spent outdoors and the performance of heavier aircraft. The department acknowledged the importance of these factors.
 - Jen provided an introduction, noting that the Airports Branch, led by Sarah Nattey, sits within her Division. Jen explained that her responsibilities include work relating to leased federal airports across Australia, including airport master planning, major development plans and Airport Environment Officer functions. She also noted that the Division is progressing a range of commitments arising from the Australian Government's 2024 *Aviation White Paper – Towards 2050*.
-

-
- Jen advised that one of the current priorities within her area is the aviation consumer protection legislation which has been introduced into Parliament. She explained that the reforms are intended to establish clearer and more transparent standards for the aviation industry for people travelling, building on existing consumer law and progressing work towards a charter of rights for passengers.

Aircraft Noise Ombudsman reforms

- Jen addressed the proposed changes to the Aircraft Noise Ombudsman (ANO), which are included in the legislative package for aviation consumer protection. She explained that the Aviation White Paper included a commitment to make the ANO function independent from Airservices Australia.
- Jen noted that the ANO currently reports to the Airservices Board and that, under the proposed legislation, the ANO function would move to the department, separating it from Airservices. In response to a question from a Community Representative, Jen confirmed that the proposed ANO function would sit within the department.
- A Community Representative asked about the likely timing of the proposed changes to the ANO. Jen advised that the aviation consumer protection legislation remained before the Senate and still needed to progress through the parliamentary process. She explained that the legislation would establish the overarching framework, with further detail to be developed through subordinate legislation, regulations and supporting instruments following passage of the legislation.
- Jen advised that implementation timing would depend on when the legislation passed Parliament. She noted that the department had initially hoped to have the arrangements operating during 2026; however, if the legislation progressed during 2026, implementation was more likely in early 2027 than by the end of 2026.
- In response to a question about whether the existing ANO appointee would transfer to the new arrangements, Jen advised that this would not occur automatically. She explained that an appointment process would be required and that the proposed legislation provides for the ANO role to be held by a Senior Executive Service officer within the department.
- Jen also noted that transition arrangements for staff currently supporting the ANO function at Airservices would need to be worked through. While noting that the department had met with the existing ANO team and would consider whether staff may transition to the department, Jen emphasised that these arrangements were not settled and remained dependent on passage of the legislation.
- Community Representatives raised questions about how matters should be handled while the transition of the ANO function remained uncertain, including whether potential applications to be submitted to the existing ANO, how matters already in train would be treated following transition, and whether matters previously considered by the existing ANO could be submitted under new arrangements following the transition.
- Jen confirmed that matters should be raised through the existing ANO process and should not be held back in anticipation of future legislative changes. Jen suggested that when the transition occurred, the department would work through the appropriate arrangements for matters already in train.
- The Chair emphasised that community members should not hold off raising matters with the ANO while the transition was being considered in parliament, and also noted that if community members raised matters after the transition that had been considered before the transition, it would be unlikely that the ANO would provide a different answer, unless something had changed.

Other administrative matters

- Kim requested feedback on the format used in the previous published minutes, which included a summary of community concerns raised during the meeting at the beginning of the minutes, noting any responses were provided in the body of the minutes. The Secretariat will continue to consider this format based on any feedback provided by the group.

-
- Jacqui O’Dea, Airservices Australia (Airservices), requested that the previous AAB out-of-session meeting regarding the Package 3 outcomes be formally recorded, even if only as a brief record of the date, attendees and key outcomes. Kim agreed that a concise record should be prepared for completeness.
 - Kim also raised the process for submitting proposed agenda items and questions for consideration in the lead up to each meeting.
 - Kim requested that Community Representatives check the published out-of-session Question and Answer material before resubmitting questions and, where a previous response was considered incomplete, to identify what additional information was being sought.
 - Kim proposed bringing forward the deadline for proposed agenda items and questions so that Airservices, BAC, the department and other presenters have more time to prepare substantive responses before meetings.

Actions

1. Secretariat to prepare a concise record of the out-of-session briefing held on 8 July 2026 (Action Item 12.1) regarding Package 3 outcomes, including date and attendees.

Agenda Item 3: Action items

The Action Items list is at Attachment A.

Kim 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 relevant to future route growth and Package 4, including material that can illustrate how future operations may look on maps.
- For **Action Item 3.4** and **Action Item 3.8**, the group agreed that the items would remain open and be revisited following consideration of the Package 3 outcomes and as relevant work under the Noise Action Plan for Brisbane progresses.
- For **Action Item 12.2**, Kim provided an update on her correspondence with the Brisbane Airport Community Aviation Consultation Group (BACACG) Chair regarding the exchange of contact details between BACACG and AAB Community Representatives.
 - Kim noted that the matter was expected to be discussed at the next BACACG meeting at the end of September.
 - In the meantime, Community Representatives could make contact directly where contact details were already available.
 - The action remains open pending the outcome of the BACACG discussion.
- For **Action Item 12.4**, Kim noted that the Secretariat distributed Airservices’ written advice regarding NCIS management plans and review processes on 6 July 2026 and that the item may now be closed.
- For **Action Item 12.5**, Brisbane Airport Corporation confirmed this item is to remain open.
- For **Action Item 12.6**, the group discussed the item:
 - BAC advised that it was still considering its approach to annual noise contour reporting. BAC noted that it was seeking to provide annual contour information that better reflects actual operations over the preceding 12 months and allows comparison with longer-term forecasts (particularly the ultimate capacity Australian Noise Exposure Forecast included in the Brisbane Airport Master Plan 2026). BAC requested that the action remain open pending further development, and sought initial views from the group to guide consideration of approach.

-
- Community Representatives noted that standard annual average noise contours may not adequately reflect the experience of communities located further from the airport, particularly in rural residential areas. Community Representatives suggested that contours should consider seasonal variations and focus on worst-case operating scenarios, particularly in relation to night-time aircraft noise, given that annual average figures could otherwise underestimate impacts.
 - BAC noted that noise contours become increasingly unreliable at lower noise levels and that averaging data over a full year can mask individual high-noise events. Community Representatives observed that the absence of a contour over an area may be interpreted by the public as indicating that aircraft noise is insignificant over the area, which may not be the case.
 - Airservices advised that its assessments are based on 12 months of operational data where available and that it has also begun considering metrics such as the busiest day, or a high-percentile busy day, to better reflect communities' lived experience, particularly at airports affected by seasonal conditions. Airservices noted that this type of information could potentially be incorporated into publicly available material.
 - A Community Representative noted that the Package 3 heat map had been developed using nine months of available data and may not have captured the full range of seasonal wind conditions. Airservices confirmed that its standard assessments utilise 12 months of data where available.
 - For **Action Item 12.7**, Kim noted that the Secretariat distributed BAC's response to a question related to Action Item 12.7 in the out-of-session document on 19 August 2026 and that a further update would be provided by Brisbane Airport Corporation under Agenda Item 5, following which the item could be closed.
 - For **Action Item 12.8**, the group discussed the item:
 - Kim noted that responses from BAC and Airservices in relation to both of Ms Janelle Moody's papers had been circulated out of session by the Secretariat on 19 August 2026 and invited Community Representatives to consider any follow-on questions they may wish to raise.
 - Janelle advised that she considered aspects of the out-of-session responses had only been partially addressed and objected to closing the action item while these remained unresolved. Janelle identified that requested historical information concerning noise monitors had not been provided, as one example, but noted that she considered there were other outstanding matters.
 - Janelle noted that the original noise monitoring paper (tabled at the AAB Meeting #12 on 24 July 2026) contained the background and rationale for the questions, including screenshots illustrating apparent inconsistencies in publicly available information concerning noise-monitoring arrangements, and that this context had not been included when questions were extracted and responses provided in the consolidated out-of-session response table.
 - Janelle raised apparent inconsistencies between publicly available information and responses provided concerning monitoring in New Farm, including uncertainty around reference to a temporary New Farm monitor, and questioned why information from separate monitoring undertaken at Oxlade Drive had not been published.
 - Janelle raised concerns around confusion arising from these separate monitoring arrangements.
 - The Secretariat clarified that both of Janelle's papers had been published alongside minutes for AAB Meeting #12 on 24 July 2026, so the context for the questions had also been published.
 - Airservices noted that it had interpreted the relevant question as asking whether historical information *could* be provided, which it had answered (i.e. if it was possible for the information to be provided), while noting that collating this information would take time.
 - Airservices noted that providing historical monitor locations alone may not address the underlying question if the request relates to the associated data and how the monitoring information was used. Airservices and BAC advised that they operate separate monitoring systems for different purposes and using different technologies. Airservices further noted that its current noise-monitoring locations are publicly available through WebTrak.
-

-
- The group discussed monitoring undertaken in the New Farm/Oxlade Drive area. BAC advised that the monitor had been deployed for validation purposes rather than as part of an ongoing public noise monitoring program, and as such, the data had not been published in the same manner as data from permanent monitoring locations.
 - Airservices advised the new noise-monitoring system contract commenced on 1 September 2026. The new contract is expected to improve data management and mapping capabilities, although implementation will take time.
 - Kim encouraged Community Representatives to clearly identify the intended purpose of information requests to assist agencies in providing targeted responses and noted that further discussion could occur offline to better define the outstanding information requirements.
 - The group requested that Airservices provide a consolidated list of noise monitors from 2007 to the present, with the action to remain open until this information was provided, and any outstanding matters clarified.
-

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 11.3**, Airservices noted that a response had been provided out of session, and this action may be closed.
- For **Action Item 11.4**, Airservices noted that the Secretariat circulated the Airservices Noise Action Plan Interactive Report and accompanying questions to guide feedback on 17 July 2026. Airservices acknowledged feedback received from Ms Tess Bignell, which was provided to Airservices by the Secretariat on 10 August 2026 following its receipt on 9 August 2026. No further feedback was raised by Community Representatives, and this action may be closed.
- For **Action Item 12.1**, Airservices noted that the out-of-session briefing session was held on Wednesday 8 July 2026, and this action may be closed.

Executive Steering Group Membership Information

For **Action Item 12.3**, Airservices noted that it had provided an overview of its governance structure (which was circulated by the Secretariat on 1 September 2026) (included as *Attachment C*.), and the item could be closed.

The group discussed the item:

- Airservices outlined that options were progressed from the Technical Delivery Working Group, through the Brisbane-specific Program Management Office and Joint Implementation Group, to the Executive Steering Group.
 - Airservices explained:
 - technical specialists develop and assess options;
 - the Program Management Office checks that the work addresses the relevant recommendation and intent and that it considers community input;
 - the Joint Implementation Group provides a multidisciplinary senior-management recommendation; and
 - the Executive Steering Group makes the final Airservices decision on whether an option proceeds to engagement or implementation.
 - Airservices noted that Think Research provides independent assurance and advice but is not a decision-maker.
 - A Community Representative queried where the AAB sat within the governance structure.
-

-
- Airservices noted that the AAB does not sit at one specific governance tier – rather, community feedback through the AAB is intended to be considered across the technical, program and executive layers as work progresses.
 - A Community Representative questioned whether the structure enables local knowledge to be considered early enough, noting that a single AAB representative may be conveying the experience of a much larger community group. The Community Representative referred to involvement with a local aircraft-noise group representing almost 300 families and noted that published engagement results may record only a small number of individual responses from an area despite an AAB Community Representative bringing forward concerns on behalf of a substantially larger group (that may not feel the need to put in individual submissions if they have raised with a Community Representative).
 - Another Community Representative agreed that the same issue arose in their area and expressed concern that low numbers of individual submissions could create an impression that a community was relatively unconcerned when this was not necessarily the case.
 - Airservices explained that community feedback is not treated as a vote, and is considered throughout the decision-making process. A submission from one person is considered on its merits, while a large number of similar submissions may indicate that an issue is more widespread.
 - Kim noted that engagement maps are principally intended to demonstrate where and how Airservices engaged with communities and should not be interpreted as showing the relative technical merit of a proposal or the weight given to individual community views, and that it was likely that the proportion of people giving feedback from areas with higher populations was also quite low (when considered with regard to the population in that area).
 - The group discussed the broader challenge of demonstrating how community feedback has influenced a decision, particularly where the final outcome does not reflect the outcome wanted by a community.
 - Kim noted that Community Representatives, and members of the community more broadly, may continue to disagree with a decision but should nevertheless be provided with sufficient information to understand why that decision was reached.
 - Airservices noted that there was significant discussion and assessment around the north-west corridor before Airservices came to its decision on Package 3.
 - Kim requested that Airservices provide the group with a non-Brisbane example, potentially from recent work in Tasmania, showing how an initially preferred flight path may change as technical, operational, and community constraints are considered. The example would assist in demonstrating the contribution of each layer of the process and why a proposal may not ultimately be adopted.
 - A Community Representative asked how the department fits within the Airservices governance arrangements, referring to the Noise Action Plan for Brisbane commitment concerning government mechanisms and departmental assurance (under Package 1 – Recommendation 1.1).
 - Airservices explained that, once a matter has progressed through Airservices' internal governance arrangements and a decision has been made by the Executive Steering Group, the decision and supporting information are briefed to the department. The department can ask questions, seek clarification and test the explanation provided. Matters may also be briefed to the Minister's Office where appropriate, noting the level of government interest in Brisbane aircraft-noise matters.
 - Airservices and the department clarified that the underlying decision remains an Airservices decision. The department's assurance role does not constitute an additional approval stage or transfer ownership of the decision from Airservices to the department.
 - Community Representatives questioned where a matter could be escalated where a community believed that the Airservices process itself had failed or that significant concerns had not been adequately addressed.
 - Community Representatives also raised concerns that there did not appear to be any separate entity to which Airservices was accountable, and that community members felt that concerns they raised had not been listened to or addressed.
-

-
- The department explained that Airservices is an independent Commonwealth corporate entity governed by a board and is responsible for its own operational decisions, which are undertaken in line with Airservices' legislative responsibilities and a Ministerial statement of expectations.
 - Depending on the nature of a concern, matters concerning Airservices governance or decision-making may be escalated within Airservices, including to its Chief Executive Officer or Board (which were not involved in the decision-making process). Matters relating specifically to aviation safety or broader administrative conduct may fall within the remit of other bodies, depending on the circumstances.
 - Kim noted that it was not the role of the department to intervene or re-make individual operational decisions by Airservices.
 - The group discussed the distinction between disagreeing with the outcome of a decision and identifying a concern about the governance or process through which the decision was reached. Community Representatives reiterated that a clearer escalation pathway would be useful, particularly where communities believe an issue has not been resolved through existing channels.
 - Community Representatives also questioned why, despite having participated in the Noise Action Plan for Brisbane process for a number of years, they had not previously been shown the program governance structure or clearly informed how community feedback progressed through that structure to decision-makers. Community Representatives expressed concern that provision of the information at this stage had limited their ability to understand and question how their feedback would be considered in the decision making process.
 - Airservices advised that it had sought to provide information when it was requested by the group and noted that additional governance information would not necessarily have altered the technical assessment or outcomes of Package 3.
 - The Chair requested that the group move on with the agenda, suggesting the item had been discussed sufficiently.
 - A Community Representative raised concerns that the governance material had only been provided the day before the meeting, that there had not been sufficient time to discuss the matter in the meeting, and that they disagreed that concerns raised had been sufficiently addressed during the meeting.
 - Kim acknowledged the concerns raised, noted the need to progress through the remaining agenda, and suggested that further questions could be addressed out of session.

Update on Noise Action Plan for Brisbane (Package 3 / Package 4)

Kim invited Airservices to provide an update on Package 3 and Package 4.

The group discussed the item:

- Community Representatives expressed concern that Package 3 had not delivered a meaningful reduction in concentration or meaningful relief for some mainland Brisbane, communities, and that use of the terms 'noise sharing', 'reduced concentration' and 'reduced frequency of flights over communities' represented to communities that Airservices was seeking to reduce the frequency and concentration of flights through flight path changes, thereby creating an expectation that concentrated flight paths would be removed, relocated or otherwise redistributed.
 - A Community Representative noted that, from their community's perspective, concentration had not reduced and in some instances was considered to have increased.
 - Community Representatives queried whether future noise sharing would primarily be delivered through alternating runway operating modes and periods of respite rather than changes to existing concentrated flight paths. A Community Representative noted that, if so, the distinction needed to be communicated more clearly.
 - Airservices confirmed that Package 4 would examine respite periods and noise-sharing options associated with alternating operating modes and that this is different to the flight path options investigated through Package 3.
-

-
- Airservices noted the language used in the Noise Action Plan for Brisbane had deliberately referred to commitments to 'investigate', 'consider' and 'review' options rather than guaranteeing that identified changes would ultimately be implemented. This reflected the fact that the impacts of potential changes could not be known until technical and environmental assessment had been undertaken.
 - Airservices noted that, in some locations, investigation of an alternative option identified adverse impacts elsewhere that meant the proposal could not reasonably be progressed. Decisions therefore require consideration of the flight path and surrounding airspace as a whole rather than only the potential benefit to one location.
 - A Community Representative emphasised that public consultation materials had expressed that Airservices would ensure that 'no single community would bear a disproportionate share of negative impacts', and to present commitments in the Noise Action Plan for Brisbane to only be commitments to investigate, consider or review potential was inconsistent with representations in these materials.
 - Community Representatives expressed concern that expected outcomes appeared to have changed during the process.
 - Airservices acknowledged that it needed to manage expectations better than it had to date.
 - Kim noted the importance of clearly distinguishing between noise *sharing* and permanently *shifting* noise from one community to another. Future material should clearly explain what Airservices is proposing to change, what it is not proposing to change and the type of benefit an option may realistically provide.
 - Kim referred to material developed for Melbourne Airport (the Melbourne Airport Noise Sharing Plan) as an example of clear communication about noise sharing and operating modes. Airservices noted this type of material was particularly relevant to Package 4.
 - Community Representatives raised concern that respite modes may provide only limited longer-term benefit because the ability to use particular modes is affected by airport capacity and traffic demand.
 - A Community Representative referred to SODPROPS and noted that it can operate only within particular conditions.
 - Airservices acknowledged that operating modes have constraints and that not every mode can be used in all traffic conditions.
 - Airservices and Kim agreed that these limitations should be communicated clearly during Package 4 consultation rather than presenting a mode only in terms of its potential benefit. Material should explain the circumstances in which a mode can operate, when it cannot operate and how increasing traffic may affect its availability.
 - Kim noted that expectations need to be realistic from the outset. Communities should not be given (or not given) information that means they could interpret *investigation* of a respite mode as a guarantee that it will provide regular or permanent respite.
 - Airservices confirmed that, during periods where maximum runway capacity is required, some respite modes would not be available.
 - Community Representatives reiterated concern that, after several years of working on the Noise Action Plan for Brisbane, some mainland Brisbane communities and the availability and effectiveness of respite measures are likely to diminish as airport traffic and capacity requirements increase.
 - Community Representatives sought greater transparency about the information and metrics used when Airservices assesses flight-path options, including population impacts and sensitive receptors such as schools.
 - A Community Representative referred to a Freedom of Information request seeking further information about assessment of a flight path and said communities wanted to understand what had been assessed and how competing factors had been considered.
 - Kim noted that a single weighting methodology may not be suitable for every flight-path decision because the significance of individual factors can vary according to the location and issue being considered. However, communities should be provided with sufficient information to understand why particular factors contributed to a final outcome.
-

-
- Kim noted that the relevant Freedom of Information process should be allowed to run its course and that the AAB should avoid simultaneously seeking the same material through multiple processes.
 - A Community Representative referred to a mistake in mapping that incorrectly located Tingalpa State School on a nearby commercial site in public consultation material, despite the school having been previously raised in connection with flight path impacts. The Community Representative expressed that this error raised broader concern about the accuracy, quality assurance, reliability and accountability of Airservices' assessment and decision-making processes.
 - Marion Lawie acknowledged that she had prepared the map and accepted responsibility for the mapping error, noting that the school address did not align correctly with the location shown in Airservices' mapping software. Marion advised that the error would be corrected as soon as practicable.
 - A Community Representative again asked for clarification of the difference between 'noise sharing' and 'noise shifting'.
 - Airservices and Kim referred to the Melbourne Airport material as providing a useful explanation of noise sharing through operating modes and noted that this approach was closely aligned with Package 4.
 - Community Representatives questioned the appropriateness of treating the operating environment following commencement of operations from Brisbane Airport's new runway as the relevant status quo or baseline. Community Representatives noted that some communities had been newly overflown following the opening of the new parallel runway and had understood the Noise Action Plan was seeking to address those impacts.
 - A Community Representative noted that they considered that assessing possible improvements against the environment following the opening of the new parallel runway was entrenching the very impacts that the Noise Action Plan for Brisbane was established to address.
 - Airservices explained that flight paths were originally designed having regard to runway alignment, safe operation and minimising the number of people overflown where possible. Airservices noted that Package 3 sought to examine whether those arrangements could be improved but could not necessarily eliminate the underlying impacts associated with the runway and airspace configuration.
 - Kim noted that the Noise Action Plan for Brisbane should not be understood as guaranteeing that all existing impacts would be removed. Rather, the work seeks opportunities to address or reduce impacts where feasible.
 - Community Representatives maintained that if Airservices' had better explained the purpose, limitations or available outcomes, and how these differed from understandings held by members of the community, this would have helped communities in understanding what outcomes may have realistically been available.

Departures to the south with northerly winds

The group turned to discussion of **Action Item 11.3**:

- Stephen Muller advised that the previous Airservices responses did not adequately address the concerns raised and displayed examples of aircraft tracks to illustrate the issue.
 - Stephen questioned why aircraft appeared to leave the published departure track when taking departures to the south, including in circumstances where weather appeared normal, and said previous references to weather, traffic and operational requirements did not provide sufficient detail to explain particular movements.
 - Airservices responded that these factors can represent genuine operational circumstances affecting individual aircraft movements, including nearby aircraft, traffic sequencing, safety requirements and air traffic control requirements that may not be apparent to an observer on the ground.
-

-
- Stephen questioned movements categorised as pilot requests and asked why the reasons for those requests were not investigated or recorded in greater detail.
 - Kim suggested that the issue be framed around the distinction between a discretionary pilot request and a request driven by an operational requirement. Further information could be sought about why pilots make such requests and whether community impacts are considered, particularly at lower altitudes.
 - Virgin Australia agreed that a pilot request and an operational requirement are not necessarily the same thing and indicated that further information could be provided from an airline operational perspective.
 - A Community Representative asked why some published flight paths appeared to be linked to one Brisbane runway and whether comparable published paths could be provided for movements from the other runway.
 - BAC explained that Brisbane's two-runway system and associated flight-path design operate within a compass-mode arrangement intended to safely manage arrivals and departures and avoid conflicting traffic, and that operations between the two runways could not be compared.
 - The group discussed circumstances where an aircraft is not following a published procedure and may instead be given a heading by air traffic control. BAC noted that operating aircraft in this way can increase controller workload.
 - BAC explained that the longer-term objective is to connect routes to both runways where this can be achieved safely and efficiently, although the interaction between routes and runway modes creates additional complexity.
 - Airservices noted that Brisbane has substantial traffic arriving and departing from both northern and southern directions, which differs from the traffic-flow characteristics of some other major airports and influenced the design approach used for Brisbane.
 - The group agreed that further technical explanation of this issue from airline representatives would be useful.

Illustration of aircraft noise spreading

Airservices presented a generic diagram illustrating how aircraft noise spreads as altitude increases:

- Airservices explained that the diagram seeks to show the general principle that aircraft noise (dBA) generally reduces with increasing altitude but it is generally audible across a wider area. Airservices emphasised that the diagram was illustrative and was not based on a specific Brisbane flight path or dataset.
- Community Representatives questioned how the illustration relates to published noise contours and noted that actual noise experienced on the ground varies according to aircraft type, power settings, phase of flight, weather conditions and whether an aircraft is turning or climbing.
- A Community Representative noted that communities outside higher-level published contours can still experience aircraft events at decibel levels that are noticeable and disruptive.
- The group discussed the effect of altitude and lateral distance from a flight path. Airservices and the airline representative provided further technical explanation about how aircraft performance, altitude and speed influence the noise experienced on the ground.
- A Community Representative asked whether source data could be provided for the diagram. Airservices clarified that the image was an explanatory illustration rather than the output of a specific dataset.
- The airline representative agreed to provide further explanatory information regarding aircraft speeds, including the distinction between indicated airspeed, true airspeed and ground speed.
- Kim noted the diagram was more likely to be useful to people with less technical knowledge than the AAB, and that it provides useful context to offset the idea that noise will only be heard immediately above a nominal flight path line on a map.

Package 3 outcomes

Airservices provided an overview of community feedback following publication of the Package 3 outcomes.

The group discussed the item:

- Airservices advised that approximately 220 unique respondents had provided feedback through various channels, including surveys, email and organised campaigns. Airservices noted that much of the feedback related directly to the Package 3 outcomes and that a number of recurring questions had been identified.
- A Community Representative questioned whether 220 respondents represented a large level of engagement. Airservices advised that this was a significant volume of feedback for this type of report and that the responses were being reviewed in detail.
- Airservices advised that the key themes emerging through the broader community feedback were generally consistent with issues already raised through the AAB.
- Airservices discussed lessons from Package 3 engagement and noted that detailed technical reports are important for transparency but are not necessarily the documents most members of the public will read. Summaries, fact sheets, videos and other accessible material therefore remain important.
- Airservices advised that lessons being carried into Package 4 include clearer dating of documents, improvements to interactive mapping, identifying supporting information earlier and using a mixture of detailed reports and more accessible explanatory material.

Package 4

Airservices provided an update on Package 4 and advised that work with Trax on reviewing the South East Queensland airspace basin and respite/noise-sharing options was continuing.

The group discussed the item:

- Airservices indicated that an AAB briefing was expected towards the end of October 2026 before broader community engagement commenced in November 2026, subject to progress of the technical work.
 - Airservices advised that Package 4 engagement is likely to use a different format from Package 3 because the work is not expected to involve the same number of discrete flight path options. Proposed engagement methods include community drop-in sessions, webinars, videos and interactive material.
 - Janelle reiterated concerns about the baseline model operating with reduced functionality during the Package 3 outcome feedback consultation period, including the absence of frequency-of-overflight, altitude and noise level information, and questioned the effect of this reduced functionality on the ability of affected communities to understand and respond to Package 3 outcomes.
 - Airservices advised that the baseline model had been fully functional during earlier engagement on preferred options, and that it did not consider the reduced functionality to have affected community feedback on outcomes.
 - Airservices noted that it expected full functionality of the baseline model to be restored before Package 4 engagement, and outlined proposed improvements to mapping tools, including expanding the grid-square search area around an address from 750 metres to 2 kilometres, and allowing users to retain an address while switching between flight paths for comparison.
 - Airservices advised that it was considering preparing 'community conversation kits' containing relevant fact sheets, explanatory material and feedback templates for people who already facilitate discussions within their local communities.
 - Airservices acknowledged concerns that the proposed materials could be perceived as enabling community members to undertake engagement on its behalf, and clarified that Airservices would remain responsible for formal engagement, with the materials intended only to provide consistent information to community members who choose to organise their own meetings or discussions.
-

-
- A Community Representative explained that substantial work had previously been required to extract information relevant to their community from the wider Noise Action Plan for Brisbane material and to combine different flight-path information into a single map that residents could readily understand.
 - The Community Representative said that visual material had been particularly effective in helping residents understand how multiple routes interacted over their area.
 - Airservices acknowledged the feedback and advised that one objective of the proposed material was to reduce the amount of work community members needed to undertake themselves to understand and explain Airservices information to their communities.
 - Community Representatives questioned why Package 4 was progressing before Airservices had completed its work on altitude-based flight-path design priorities, particularly given the Australian Government's supported a recommendation to move Australia's flight-path design principles towards an altitude-based priorities approach in its response to the final report from the Senate Inquiry into impact and mitigation of aircraft noise.
 - A Community Representative expressed concern that Package 4 options could be developed before a key future design principle was settled and questioned whether the work should be delayed.
 - Airservices explained that altitude-based priorities are being developed as future flight-path design principles rather than fixed altitude restrictions. Under the concept being investigated, community noise impacts would receive greater priority below an identified altitude, while above that altitude greater emphasis could be placed on operational efficiency.
 - Airservices stressed that this would not mean aircraft would be prohibited from flying below a particular altitude.
 - Airservices advised that the work remained at an early stage and would require further consultation with the department, Airservices governance bodies and industry before implementation.
 - Airservices said Trax is involved in both the Package 4 work and the altitude-priority work and will be aware of the developing principles when considering Package 4 options. Airservices therefore did not consider that Package 4 needed to be delayed until the altitude-priority work was finalised.
 - The airline representative noted that flight-path design also needs to account for operational complexity and safety, including the interaction of altitude and speed constraints with Standard Instrument Departures and Standard Terminal Arrival Routes.
 - Airservices reiterated that safety remains the first flight path design priority.
 - Airservices advised that safety work was continuing on the proposed night-time trial of the sharp left turn from the new runway over land and that a decision was being targeted for November 2026.
 - A Community Representative asked whether limitations on respite modes would be made clear during Package 4 consultation, particularly where increasing airport traffic could restrict their availability.
 - Airservices confirmed that capacity and operating limitations would be communicated and noted that modes which reduce overall runway capacity would not generally be available during peak periods where maximum runway capacity is required.
 - Kim reiterated that engagement material should clearly communicate both the potential benefit of a respite mode and the limits on when and how frequently it could realistically operate.
 - Community Representatives again noted concern that, as airport traffic grows, periods during which respite modes are available could diminish.

Actions

2. Airline representatives to consider what additional information can be provided about movements recorded as pilot requests, including the distinction between discretionary requests and operational requirements and the reasons requests may be made.
 3. Airservices to provide a non-Brisbane example illustrating how a flight-path proposal progresses through the relevant governance arrangements and how technical, operational and community considerations can influence the final outcome.
 4. Airservices to provide information on appropriate escalation pathways for Airservices governance and process concerns.
 5. Chair to circulate Melbourne Airport noise-sharing material (Melbourne Airport Noise Sharing Plan).
-

Agenda Item 5: Brisbane Airport Corporation update

Due to time constraints, the substantive BAC briefing was not completed during the scheduled meeting.

The group briefly discussed the item:

- BAC advised that information on the eastern runway works program was going to take an extended period of time to present and proposed a separate Teams briefing for the AAB.
- The group discussed whether the briefing could be held jointly with the BACACG or as a separate AAB session. BAC noted that a smaller AAB session may provide more time for detailed questions.
- BAC offered to accommodate an after-hours session of approximately 30 to 60 minutes, with a 5:00 pm start discussed as suitable for some community members.
- BAC and Kim will coordinate the date, format and invitation for the briefing.

Actions

6. BAC and Chair to arrange an out-of-session briefing to Community Representatives on the upcoming eastern runway works program (on 10 September 2026).

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

Ms Tess Bignell – Airline Matters

Note: Due to time constraints, this item was not discussed during the meeting. David McCutcheon provided a response to matters raised by Ms Tess Bignell for tabling during the meeting (Attachment D).

Discussion – Questions arising from out of session items

Kim noted that written responses had been circulated before the meeting to various matters submitted by Community Representatives, and that some matters had also been discussed under action items and the Airservices update.

The group discussed the item:

- Community Representatives noted that the provision of a written response did not necessarily mean that substantive issues had been answered or resolved.
- Community Representatives had raised concerns regarding noise-monitor coverage, monitor locations and status, the relationship between Airservices and BAC monitoring systems, consistency of publicly available information, transparency of monitoring data, WebTrak functionality and community confidence in reported outcomes.
- The group noted that the substantive discussion of these matters had occurred earlier in the meeting, including under **Action Item 12.8**.
- Airservices reiterated that its new noise-monitoring-system contract commenced on 1 September 2026 and that improvements to data handling, mapping and public-facing systems would be progressively implemented.
- Airservices noted that responses had been provided out of session to community papers concerning Package 3 flight-path matters. Further follow-up information had subsequently been received on some matters and additional responses would therefore be required.
- Other community questions, including matters relating to defence airspace and over-ocean operations, had also been responded to out of session.
- Due to time constraints, not all submitted matters or follow-up questions were discussed during the meeting, with Community Representatives to be given an opportunity to consider and raise matters out of session.

Agenda Item 7: Other Business

The group discussed other business.

Potential for further aircraft noise management measures

The group discussed overall outcomes of the Noise Action Plan for Brisbane.

- Community Representatives addressed departmental representatives before they had to leave the meeting.
- Community Representatives acknowledged the substantial work undertaken but expressed annoyance and strong disappointment that the Noise Action Plan for Brisbane had not produced meaningful relief for many mainland Brisbane communities.
- Community Representatives emphasised that Airservices and the community had been engaging on aircraft noise following the opening of the New Parallel Runway for more than six years, and that no changes were to be implemented which would benefit inland communities to the north and west of the airport, other than those that were incidental to supporting Independent Parallel Runway Operations was deeply frustrating, particularly because in certain circumstances, noise was increasing.
- Community Representatives expressed concern that the objectives of reduced concentration and noise sharing did not appear to have produced substantive outcomes for many mainland communities.
- Community Representatives expressed concern that the availability and effectiveness of any respite modes to be considered during Package 4 were likely to diminish as airport traffic and capacity requirements increased, that the benefit of SODPROPs was limited, and that the Tailwind Trial had received limited uptake to date.
- With this in mind, Community Representatives requested that the department consider whether more could be done to improve aircraft noise outcomes for communities in and around Brisbane.
- Community Representatives referred to other potential noise-management measures, including full-length departures, airline scheduling, noise-abatement procedures, night-time operating arrangements, slot management and noise insulation which could also be considered.
- Kim noted that several of these matters require policy or regulatory decisions beyond the remit of Airservices and BAC.
- Kim acknowledged community frustration and noted the importance of distinguishing measures that Airservices and BAC can progress under existing arrangements from broader reforms requiring government direction.
- Departmental and Airservices representatives left the meeting at 3:00 PM, noting follow-on meetings.

Discussion between Community Representatives and Virgin Australia Representatives

Community Representatives and Virgin Australia discussed aircraft operations and practical opportunities to reduce community noise impacts.

- Virgin Australia discussed aircraft climb profiles and explained that aircraft generally reduce from take-off power after approximately 1,000 feet before establishing a more stable climb-power setting. Derated climb power may be used where appropriate for operational reasons and to reduce engine wear.
 - Virgin Australia discussed the relationship between aircraft speed and climb performance and noted that aircraft weight, turbulence, weather and other operational factors can affect performance.
 - A Community Representative noted that references to 'weather' can be frustrating for residents where conditions appear normal from the ground. Virgin Australia explained that operational weather considerations are not limited to visibly poor weather at ground level and may include atmospheric conditions affecting aircraft performance at altitude.
 - A Community Representative asked what additional steps airlines or individual pilots could realistically take to reduce aircraft noise over communities.
-

-
- Virgin Australia advised that there are limited discretionary measures available once an aircraft is operating within the required flight-path and safety framework and that crews must comply with operational and safety requirements.
 - The group discussed climb power, aircraft configuration and noise-abatement departure procedures.
 - Virgin Australia explained that:
 - Noise Abatement Departure Procedure 1 retains take-off flap for longer and can result in an aircraft gaining more altitude earlier, but may produce different noise impacts during the initial climb.
 - Noise Abatement Departure Procedure 2 retracts flap earlier, reducing aerodynamic drag and noise but potentially resulting in the aircraft remaining lower for longer.
 - Virgin Australia noted that neither procedure provides a universally better noise outcome for all communities and that the impact depends on where a community is located relative to the aircraft's climb profile.
 - The group also discussed arrival procedures. Virgin Australia advised that a continuous descent is generally efficient and comparatively quiet where operationally available. However, Brisbane arrival routes include altitude and other constraints that can require crews to alter descent rates and add power, limiting what can be achieved by the pilot without changes to the underlying route design.
 - Virgin Australia agreed to provide written information explaining climb-power settings and climb profiles and the distinction between indicated airspeed, true airspeed and ground speed.
 - Virgin Australia also offered to investigate whether a flight-simulator session could be arranged for AAB Community Representatives.
 - The group discussed the potential value of using a simulator to demonstrate how operational decisions appear from the flight deck and the practical constraints affecting aircraft performance.
 - Potential scenarios included different noise-abatement departure procedures, derated thrust, full-length departures, aircraft weight, tight turns shortly after departure, arrival and departure constraints, route design and the effect of runway configurations and multiple routes on capacity.
 - Community Representatives expressed interest in understanding whether multiple arrival routes could be introduced and the extent to which capacity or safety considerations limit this.
 - Virgin Australia agreed to discuss the proposal internally and provide further information to the Secretariat. If a session can be arranged, Community Representatives would be invited to suggest specific scenarios for demonstration.
 - Kim thanked members, industry representatives and departmental guests for their participation and closed the meeting at 3.20pm.

Actions

7. Virgin Australia to provide written information on aircraft climb-power settings and climb profiles and the distinction between indicated airspeed, true airspeed and ground speed.
8. Virgin Australia to investigate a potential flight-simulator session for Community Representatives and provide further information to the Secretariat.
9. Community Representatives to consider matters discussed in relation to Action Item 12.3 during meeting 13, and out-of-session responses shared before meeting 13, and if there are further questions, queries or outstanding matters, to raise with the Chair and Secretariat.

The next AAB meeting is scheduled for Wednesday 25 November 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 #13. 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 #13. Item to be revisited following consideration of Package 3 outcomes and as relevant work under the Noise Action Plan for Brisbane progresses.
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 #13. Item to be revisited following consideration of Package 3 outcomes and as relevant work under the Noise Action Plan for Brisbane progresses.
12.2	24 June 2026	BACACG 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	Discussed during meeting #13. Chair has discussed with BACACG Chair, and expects the request will be considered at the next BACACG meeting. Item to remain open.

No.	Meeting Date	Item	Requirement	Responsible Person	Completion Date	Status
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	Discussed during meeting #13. BAC advised it was conferring with provider on feasibility. Item to remain open until response received.
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	Discussed during meeting #13. BAC continues to consider approach, and will report back to the group.
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	Discussed during meeting #13. Secretariat circulated BAC and Airservices response on 19 August 2026. Airservices to provide a consolidated list of noise monitors from 2007 to the present. Item to remain open until this information is received. In addition, Janelle to clarify matters she considers have not received an adequate response, so that clarification may be sought.
13.1	2 September 2026	Record of out-of-session briefing on Package 3 outcomes	Secretariat to prepare a concise record of the out-of-session briefing held on 8 July 2026 (Action Item 12.1) regarding Package 3 outcomes, including date and attendees.	Secretariat	Prior to next meeting	New item. Concise record of out-of-session briefing is noted in these minutes and against Action Item 12.1 under Closed Action Items.
13.2	2 September 2026	Further information on pilot requests	Airline representatives to consider what additional information can be provided about movements recorded as pilot requests, including the distinction between discretionary requests and operational requirements and the reasons requests may be made.	Airline representatives (Virgin Australia lead)	At next meeting	New item
13.3	2 September 2026	Non-Brisbane flight path decision example	Airservices to provide a non-Brisbane example illustrating how a flight-path proposal progresses through relevant governance arrangements and how technical, operational and community considerations can influence the final outcome.	Airservices	Prior to next meeting	New item

No.	Meeting Date	Item	Requirement	Responsible Person	Completion Date	Status
13.4	2 September 2026	Airservices escalation pathways	Airservices to provide information on appropriate escalation pathways for Airservices governance and process concerns.	Airservices	Prior to next meeting	New item
13.5	2 September 2026	Melbourne Airport Noise Sharing Plan	Chair to circulate Melbourne Airport noise-sharing material.	Chair	Prior to next meeting	New item.
13.6	2 September 2026	Out-of-session briefing – eastern runway works	BAC and Chair to arrange an out-of-session briefing to Community Representatives on the upcoming eastern runway works program (on 10 September 2026).	BAC Chair	10 September 2026	New item. Session was held on 10 September 2026.
13.7	2 September 2026	Clarification of aircraft power settings, climb profiles and aircraft speed	Virgin Australia to provide written information on aircraft climb-power settings and climb profiles and the distinction between indicated airspeed, true airspeed and ground speed.	Virgin Australia	Prior to next meeting	New item
13.8	2 September 2026	Potential flight simulator session	Virgin Australia to investigate a potential flight-simulator session for Community Representatives and provide further information to the Secretariat.	Virgin Australia	Prior to next meeting	New item
13.9	2 September 2026	Out-of-session matters	Community Representatives to consider matters discussed in relation to Action Item 12.3 during meeting 13, and out-of-session responses shared before meeting 13, and if there are further questions, queries or outstanding matters, to raise with the Chair and Secretariat.	Community Representatives Chair Secretariat	Prior to next 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.
11.3	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 #13. Secretariat distributed Airservices' response to further queries from Stephen Muller on 18 August 2026. Stephen emphasised that he did not consider that responses provided were satisfactory. Item closed, noting related action being progressed as Action Item 13.2.
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	Secretariat provided feedback received from Community Representatives to Airservices on 10 August 2026. Item closed.
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	Meeting held in-person on 8 July 2026. Attendees included the Chair and Community Representatives, and representatives from Airservices, BAC and the departmental Secretariat. Item closed.
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	Secretariat distributed Airservices' information on 1 September 2026. Item closed.

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	Secretariat distributed Airservices' written advice on 6 July 2026. Item closed.
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	Secretariat distributed BAC's response on 18 August 2026. Item closed.