Brisbane Airport Community Airspace Advisory Board (AAB)

Meeting Minutes

DATE	LOCATION
27 August 2025	Brisbane Airport Conference Centre – Pullman Hotel
MEETING TITLE:	**Brisbane Airport Community Airspace Advisory Board Meeting 9**
MEETING TIME:	**START TIME – 12.30 END TIME – 15:00**

Attendees

Name	Position
Kim Jordan	Chair – Brisbane Airport Community Airspace Advisory Board (AAB)
David Diamond	Community Representative
Tess Bignell	Community Representative
Stephen Muller	Community Representative
Janelle Moody	Community Representative
Matthew Loveday	Community Representative
Peter Curran	Airservices Australia – Deputy Chief Executive Officer
Russell McArthur	Airservices Australia – Head of Noise and Environment
Donna Marshall	Airservices Australia – Head of Community Engagement
Jacqui O'Dea	Airservices Australia – Chief Risk, Noise and Environment Officer
Alex Tikoft	Airservices Australia – Head of Airspace and Aerodrome Services (Brisbane)
Tim Boyle	Brisbane Airport Corporation – Head of Airspace Management
Henry Tuttiett	Brisbane Airport Corporation – Executive General Manager, Communications and Public Affairs
Luke Van Dongen	Virgin Australia – Fleet Manager
Dave McCutcheon	Qantas Freight – Deputy Chief Pilot
Sarah Nattey	Assistant Secretary, Airports Branch, Domestic Aviation and Reform, Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development, Communications, Sport and the Arts (DITRDCSA)
Andrew Marshall	Director, QLD, SA and NT Airports, Airports Branch, DITRDCA
Rachel Lee	Secretariat, DITRDCSA
Tara Ironside	Secretariat, DITRDCSA

Apologies

Craig Charker – Head of Network Planning & Optimisation.

Minutes

Agenda Item 1: Welcome and Acknowledgement of Country

The Chair, Kim Jordan, opened the meeting at 12:30 PM and welcomed members and industry advisors. She acknowledged the traditional Custodians of the land on which Brisbane Airport is located, the Turrbal people, and paid respects to Elders past and present. She also acknowledged Traditional Owners across Australia.

Agenda Item 2: Administration

Kim introduced the meeting.

Tess Bignell, Russell McArthur, David McCutcheon and Luke Van Dongen attended the meeting virtually.

Other matters:

- The Chair welcomed Jacqui O'Dea to the AAB, noting this was her first in-person meeting. Jacqui is the Chief Risk, Noise and Environment Office at Airservices Australia (Airservices)
- The Chair welcomed Henry Tuttiett, Executive General Manager Communications and Public Affairs for Brisbane Airport Corporation (BAC). Henry advised he had been with Brisbane Airport since April 2024, and in July 2025 was appointed to his current position. He explained his background in media and public affairs.
- The Chair welcomed Alex Tikoft, Head of Airspace and Aerodrome Services (Brisbane), Airservices. Alex explained he had worked with Airservices for 10 years, including five years as an Air Traffic Controller in Melbourne.
- Kim noted that Craig Charker was an apology for the meeting.
- Stephen Muller queried why Marion Lawie was not present. Donna Marshall explained that Airservices wanted to maintain balance between industry advisor and community representative attendance at the meeting. Kim confirmed that she was not supportive of industry advisors outnumbering community representatives in the forum.
- Matthew Loveday asked whether Sarah Nattey would be in attendance as the Departmental Representative. Kim confirmed that Sarah Nattey and Andrew Marshall were finalising the site visit for **Action Item 8.1**, but would be arriving shortly.
- Kim reminded attendees that the meeting was being recorded to support the Secretariat in developing the minutes, and that a microphone had been provided to improve audio.
- Kim noted that *Agenda Item 4* (Airline presentation) would be moved to the end of the meeting to allow more time for discussion of other items.
- Kim also noted that David Diamond would need to leave the meeting at 2:30 PM.

Late Items for Other Business:

- Kim noted that Janelle Moody had sent an email raising concerns around community consultation activities under Phase 6 of the Noise Action Plan for Brisbane on 25 August 2025 for discussion during the meeting, which had been provided to Airservices on the morning of 27 August 2025. Kim noted that much of the content would likely be addressed in relation to Tess Bignell's item under *Agenda Item 6*, or would otherwise be responded to out of session.

- Kim also noted Janelle's proposed item regarding the Aircraft Noise Ombudsman's (ANO) report of 21 August 2025 outlining findings and recommendations around compliance with Noise Abatement Procedures at Gold Coast Airport may be tabled for the next AAB Meeting.
- No other late items were raised.

Agenda Item 3: Action items

The Action Items list is at Attachment A.

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

- For **Action Item 1.1**, Airservices had provided 2024 figures for information out of session, and could be discussed further during *Agenda Item 3A* (the item is to remain open until BAC publishes route growth forecast maps that had not been published alongside the Brisbane Airport draft Master Plan 2026).
- For **Action Item 5.1**, the Airlines would give a presentation under *Agenda Item 4*.
- For **Action Item 7.3**, the Secretariat had finalised the Community Question and Answer document, which was published on the department's website, and welcomed feedback on its presentation and accessibility, with the item to be closed, and the document to be updated after each meeting.
- For **Action Item 8.1**, the departmental representatives were currently finalising the site visit and would report back to the group under *Agenda Item 8*, with the item to be closed.
- For **Action Item 8.8**, a letter outlining the AAB's views on recommendations in the final report from the *Senate Inquiry into impact and mitigation of aircraft noise* had been finalised and sent to the Hon Catherine King MP, Minister for Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local Government, and the item could be closed. Kim noted that Sarah Nattey would provide any updates on the Government's response to the Senate Enquiry later in the agenda.
- For **Action Item 8.9**, the briefing sessions had been completed out of session, and the item could be closed.

Agenda Item 3A: Action items – Airservices

The Chair then passed over to Airservices representatives to present on action items that were directly related to Airservices Australia.

Donna Marshall presented the item. A copy of Airservices' presentation is at *Attachment B*.

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

- For **Action Item 1.1**, Airservices had published 2024 flight path usage data on the Engage Airservices webpage as part of the Package 3 engagement process. A copy was circulated out of session through the Secretariat on 21 August 2025.
- For **Action Item 8.1**, Donna and Tim Boyle, BAC, had provided a proposed itinerary for the department based on both northerly and southerly wind conditions, and that Sarah Nattey would provide a further update under *Agenda Item 8*.
- For **Action Item 8.2** and **Action Item 8.6**, Airservices would present revised SIDs adherence visualisations and an updated program schedule later in *Agenda Item 5*.
- For **Action Item 8.5**, Airservices had published information relating to noise sharing to FAQs on the Noise Action Plan for Brisbane website., This information was circulated through the Secretariat to the AAB on 21 August 2025.
- For **Action Item 8.7**, the Package 3 briefing had been held on 8 July 2025, and responses to questions raised in relation to the briefing were circulated through the Secretariat on 21 August 2025.

Donna also noted Airservices had addressed matters that had been raised by community members out of session.

The group discussed **Action Item 3.4** and **Action Item 3.8**:

- Donna advised that Airservices had consulted with Think Research, its independent experts, and briefed them on questions raised by AAB community representatives regarding metrics, and proposed to hold an out-of-session briefing between Think Research and Community Representatives on metrics to provide an update on the item. The group agreed that the session would be valuable and that the Secretariat would confirm availability of Community Representatives for the session.
- Community Representatives requested a copy of the material that had been provided to Think Research to inform their approach. Donna noted that this had already been circulated to Community Representatives, but could be re-circulated by the Secretariat.

The group discussed **Action Item 7.5:**

- Donna noted that she had met with Kim and Tess to discuss the benefits of CASA's complaint forms, and that Airservices anticipated it would go to market in due course for the provision of a complaints management system. Donna noted feedback provided by Tess would be considered and that Airservices would continue to update the group on complaint management processes.
- Janelle queried whether Community Representatives would be given an opportunity to input into development of any new complaint forms and complaint management systems.
- Donna noted that once a supplier and system had been selected, there may be opportunities for Community Representatives to test the solution and provide feedback (noting that there may be some system limitations in the changes that Airservices could make), but that Airservices would have to take the question on notice and report back to the group.
- Janelle queried whether the meeting with Tess and the Chair had been beneficial to help Airservices in understanding community expectations. Donna confirmed that Tess had emphasised that the primary benefit of CASA's system was maintaining a record of each engagement that allows both parties to see prior correspondence.
- Tess emphasised that the ability to see all prior correspondence in a single place was valuable to community members.
- Jacqui O'Dea reminded members that implementation of any new system or solution was still some time away, with a tender process needing to be undertaken, and no system likely to be ready before late-2026.
- Janelle noted there were areas Airservices could improve in the interim, such as providing clearer responses linked to original complaints, and offered to provide examples of correspondence that did not substantively address the matters raised.
- Donna welcomed these examples. She noted responses do paraphrase the question and include the original complaint date in the opening paragraph, for clarity.

Donna then continued to provide Airservices' update to the group (included as *Agenda Item 6*).

Action Item 8.6 – updated program schedule

Donna presented a program schedule that set out the differences and delays between the originally proposed schedule for the Noise Action Plan for Brisbane, and the current schedule:

- Donna noted that for each engagement activity, Airservices normally allows four weeks for engagement and two to four weeks for review, however at each stage of the process, more submissions have been received that anticipated, requiring more time to ensure all feedback was considered in the design process.
- Donna noted delays compared with the initial schedule were also partly due to the longer-than-expected process to appoint design consultant TRAX, which had not really been considered in the initial timelines, and also the caretaker period at the start of 2025, when Australian Government agencies could not progress new proposals until after May 2025.

- Donna also highlighted that some Package Two options had been moved into Packages Three and Four, leaving some matters unresolved from earlier packages.

Donna asked members whether the community would find value in seeing this information and if improvements were needed before release. In response:

- David Diamond agreed that the information was valuable for the community, and publicly sharing the information was crucial for accountability.
- David suggested the AAB should be looking at how the delivery schedule was tracking at each meeting, noting that it was important to be clear that implementation of the Noise Action Plan for Brisbane was 12 months behind what had originally been proposed.
- David Diamond questioned whether Airservices was genuinely engaging on proposed options or simply following procedures.
- Peter Curran and Donna emphasised that community feedback was genuinely valued, and that the extensive consultation period was necessary due to the complexity of the proposed flight path changes.
- Kim noted Airservices had set out an extended timeframe for Package Four.
- Matt asked whether implementation of Package Four relied on a new IT system.
- Donna explained one of the recommendations under Package Four was dependent on this new IT system, as setting and tracking multiple arrival paths with on/off scheduling could not be supported by the current IT system, and would require the implementation of the civil-military air traffic control system (OneSky), expected in 2027. Donna noted this was only a small part of Package Four.
- Matthew noted that implementation of multiple arrival paths appeared delayed, questioned whether implementation of the new IT system was on track for being delivered in 2027 (noting that there can be significant delays in IT projects), suggesting this should also be accounted for in the delivery schedule.
- Tess Bignell noted people often query the gap between consultation and implementation outcomes, and suggested further information on implementation timeframes could be included alongside the project delivery schedule material.
- David concurred that the proposed schedule should be complemented by an additional page that set out what was implemented form each package, and what the outcomes were (particularly Package Three), and expressed concern that a large amount of material could make relevance unclear.
- Donna advised that sometimes the gap between consultation and implementation would be around six months, sometimes up to 12 months, depending on the complexity of the change.
- Donna asked whether to finalise the slide before release or develop it further after release.
- Kim suggested the slide had too much text, distracting from the diagram, and recommended having a simple version, which also included delivery, as from the community perspective, delivery and implementation are effectively the same thing.
- Tess noted strong community discussion on social media about the what the successes of the Noise Action Plan had actually been, and which areas had seen noise reduction.
- Kim noted that material outlining implementation and associated outcomes would be valuable as an input into the AAB's annual report to the Minister.
- Matt raised concerns over the use of the term "de-concentration", which he felt would damage trust with the community, noting that while new "deconcentrated" flight paths would be used, there substantial increases in demand and flights was anticipated in any instance, which was not clear from consultation materials.
- Donna explained that Airservices took the view that metrics should use current data to ensure consistent comparisons could be credibly made between current and proposed flight path changes.
- Matt emphasised that with a predicted a 220 per cent increase in air traffic over the longer term, it was not credible to say that Package Three would deliver de-concentration.
- Kim suggested that there was a way to set out comparisons that incorporated future forecasts, noting that suggested an environmental impact statement with a 40-year forecast could be useful, even if not 100 per cent accurate).
- Peter Curran, acknowledged Matt's concerns, but emphasised that as future traffic distribution was not yet known, Airservices were concerned about whether such forecasts could be presented credibly.
- Peter asked whether adjusting current data to reflect growth would be helpful, giving an example that the impact of 13 removals now might double in the future. Members agreed this would be useful.

- Stephen Muller recommended using a disclaimer if future modelling was included.
- Jacqui O'Dea suggested hosting such information separately on the Airservices website in an interactive format, with disclaimers.
- Donna and Kim agreed to discuss approach further offline.
- Steve noted metrics should identify where impacts shifted if noise was redistributed. David agreed there should be a way to represent future scenarios.
- Janelle Moody noted the slide was serving a dual purpose — explaining delays while also highlighting consultation fatigue. She suggested breaking the slide into quarters before publishing.
- Janelle asked whether "extended consultation" meant the consultation period itself was extended.
- Donna clarified that it referred to the additional time required to review feedback, with the usual four to five weeks of consultation still applying.

Deep Dive – Further Questions from Phase 6 briefing

Donna reported that following the Phase 6 Briefing, Tess had raised a question about changes in aircraft tracking over an area for departures towards the WACKO waypoint. Data for March to May 2025 was reviewed, covering daytime movements. The group discussed the presented information:

- Donna noted March had fewer movements due to Cyclone Alfred. She explained adherence would not be perfect due to radar departures (not track on a SID) and traffic levels, but that in general adherence over the period had been in the high 80s percentage range.
- Tess commented that the latest language referred to "1 nautical mile off the SID," whereas community information used "1 kilometre either side of the centre line."
- David McCutcheon, Qantas representative, clarified this was an RNP1 standard and an international design standard.
- Donna acknowledged the terminology difference and said Airservices would keep this in mind in future community material (noting that 1 nautical mile off the SID covered an area of approximately 900 meters either side of the centreline of the SID, which is close to the kilometre used in community information).
- David Diamond asked if 85 per cent adherence was good or poor adherence rate.
- Peter responded that he felt it was a good adherence rate, particular for a major international airport, and would vary seasonally with weather, but that Airservices would continue to monitor adherence and were tracking long term performance.
- Steve queried at what threshold Airservices would be concerned about SID adherence.
- Alex Tikoft, Airservices, advised he reports weekly to the Airservices CEO and Peter Curran on adherence across all SIDs, to track performance and identify areas for improvement, and if he identified a drop-in adherence it would be investigated.
- David Diamond asked whether Alex would notice variations.
- Alex confirmed he would, noting significant changes would be due to severe weather, but if there were ongoing issues it could be require looking at SID design or route structure.
- Pete emphasised SID adherence was a priority for Airservices, to ensure operations matched what was consulted on with the community.
- Janelle asked where the aim point was shown on the slide. Donna explained adherence was measured at waypoints along the SID.
- Tess observed paths were narrow at WACKO but more spread at TOGAN. She noted complaints were arising from Package 3, with residents already impacted despite not being directly on the path.
- David McCutcheon explained TOGAN was a flyover waypoint, and wider spreads occurred due to aircraft turn radius, dependent on mass, speed, and momentum. Alongside TOGAN, IGMAS was also a flyover waypoint, while WACKO was a flyby waypoint, leading to more consistent tracks. David emphasised that these variations were a matter of physics, and change with changes in technology.
- Tess acknowledged the explanation but said it did not align with Airservices' baseline model.
- David McCutcheon advised he had looked at some international examples for SID adherence. Airports in the United Kingdom London airport targeted 70 per cent adherence, and the US Federal Aviation Administration setting a 75 per cent adherence rate for its major airports, meaning that an 85 per cent adherence rate seemed strong by global standards.

- Kim asked if members were satisfied with information presented in the diagram (even if they wanted it in relation to other waypoints).
- The group agreed the information was valuable, though Matt and Tess also emphasised that an explanation of why aircraft were not turned over water would be important.
- Matthew noted Airservices' percentages compared highly with international benchmarks and should be published.
- Donna noted SID adherence was lower at night time, and that Airservices was investigating this.

Donna then presented further slides addressing questions that had been raised by Janelle about night-time operations over New Farm. She explained that aircraft were turning short of the departure path, but that a new ATC direction introduced in March required aircraft to remain on SIDs to 20,000 feet. July 2025 results reflected this change, and were substantially improved. The group then discussed the slide:

- Janelle asked whether the slide depicted night-time flights, which Donna confirmed.
- Janelle said Airservices' baseline model did not capture curved paths and their noise impact on suburbs, and asked if the baseline and New Farm noise monitor could be reviewed. She thanked Airservices for the diagram.
- David McCutcheon explained the difference in noise on the riverside versus lower side due to aircraft banking.

KPI / Outcome Data

Donna then moved on to presenting some data intended to confirm outcomes from operational changes that had been made under the *Noise Action Plan for Brisbane*, such as early turboprop turns sending aircraft over the bay rather than residential areas, comparing the period from December 2022 to July 2023 with the period from December 2023 to July 2024. The data showed that there had been a proportional increase in flight over industrial land, and a proportional decrease in flights over residential areas.

Donna sought feedback on whether the data was useful. The group discussed the outcome data:

- David Diamond emphasised that the comparative data was useful, and where improvements could be seen, noting it was important that the community understood how noise was being shared across Brisbane.

Donna then presented a SODROPS slide, asking how it could be improved for community use. The group discussed the outcome data:

- Matt expressed concern at the low use of SODROPS in June 2024 and June 2025.
- Tess asked about the reasoning behind hours when SODROPS were available but not used, noting July's 20 unused hours.
- Donna explained these were noted in reporting, usually due to weather, runway works, or operational reasons. Reports are issued on a monthly basis, so interested community members won't be able to see data for one month until the next month. Donna noted that monthly data was released on the 9th of the following month.
- Alex added that his team tracks daily why SODROPS were not used.
- David Diamond asked if SODROPS was a priority for Air Traffic Control.
- Alex confirmed it was, and Donna noted SODPROPS was getting much more use outside of priority hours as a result of this.
- David queried whether this relative prioritisation was a recent change.
- Alex confirmed it was a change that had happened over time. Jacqui noted that SODPROPS usage was the priority for the Airservices Australia Board as well, and Peter acknowledged that this had not been the case two years ago.
- Donna noted that Airservices was trying to get better fly ability on the southern departure, and that Air Traffic Control and the design team were looking at what could be done to improve track adherence
- Donna noted she would take on board the group's feedback and circulate proposals for publishing KPI information out of session.

- Matthew suggested publishing data in altitude segments to help communities understand impacts.

Noise Action Plan for Brisbane update

Donna then provided an update on the recently closed Phase 6 engagement, which ran from 14 July to 24 August 2025. As part of providing this update, Donna reported that over 1,000 submissions had been received, and that Airservices had released explanatory videos which were very well received, being viewed over 20,000 times in a two-week period.

David Diamond asked whether this level of engagement was high compared with other airports. Donna responded that it was, noting that engagement also varied depending on the scope of change.

Tess Bignell queried whether Airservices had an update to provide on **Action Item 8.4**, relating to D'Aguilar National Park. Donna requested that the Secretariat send through a note with the relevant Action Item to clarify.

The Chair then moved discussion on to *Agenda Item 5*, noting that Tess Bignell had tabled a paper on Package Three consultation.

Action

1. Airservices and Think Research to provide out of session briefing on noise metrics. The Secretariat will support with scheduling the session.
2. Janelle Moody to provide examples of complaint responses to the Secretariat for sharing with Airservices.
3. Airservices to revise presented KPI and outcomes data presented based on the group's feedback, and circulate revised data and proposed approach to publishing the information out of session.

Agenda Item 4: Airline Representatives

Note: presentation of this item was moved to discussion under *Agenda Item 9*.

Agenda Item 5 – Community member issues – raised prior to meeting

The Chair led discussion of the items raised by Community Representatives for discussion in the meeting.

Considering community impacts in airline basing decisions

Note: this item was not discussed during the meeting, and may be a topic for further discussion in a future meeting.

KPI Metrics Paper – David Diamond

The Chair queried whether there was a need to further discuss metrics. The group agreed that metrics had been sufficiently discussed in prior agenda items. A copy of the paper tabled by David is at *Attachment C.*

Package Three Consultation – Tess Bignell

The Chair passed to Tess to provide a community perspective on Package Three consultation. A copy of the paper tabled by Tess is at *Attachment D*.

Tess emphasised Package Three consultation had had a momentous impact on the community, and communities were keen to understand next steps, including:

- How Airservices would make decisions on preferred options following the consultation, and when outcomes would be known; and
- How Package Three will relate to Package Four, and if Airservices would release a Statement on Package Four, including likely timing and how proposed runway operating modes would affect communities, and particular, how these would provide relief.

Donna responded that Package Four relief would be dependent on what the proposed options are, and with that in mind could not be pre-empted, and then queried if feedback was coming from particular areas.

Tess noted feedback was from areas impacted by arrival paths, but noted that she could share further details with Donna offline.

The group continued to discuss Package 4 and Phase 6 next steps:

- Donna explained that runway mode would determine flight paths and that respite modes would mostly use existing paths, except the multiple arrival path option, which could shift routes. Detailed safety and Air Traffic Control analysis was still required.
- Tess said the community needed more information about Package Four.
- Matt asked whether Package Four respite modes were high capacity, and why Package Four only included arrival routes, and not departure routes. Donna took these questions on notice.
- Matt noted that people had great hope that IT upgrades noted in Package Four would provide relief.
- Kim noted that the community in general would benefit from more information on Package Four.
- Peter noted that Airservices appreciated that there was nervousness in communities around Package Four, but emphasised that there was no secret information that was being kept from communities.
- Peter suggested Airservices would explore releasing explanatory information, and queried if this would be useful.
- Community Representatives expressed agreement that the notification would be useful, and emphasised that this should outline when outcomes from Phase 6 consultation would be available, some explanation around what had changed to this point, and next steps.
- Airservices Representatives agreed to release communications around Phase Six consultation outcomes and next steps, including when a report would be available, when outcomes could be implemented, and further detail on Package Four.
- Donna also noted that some Package Three actions remained, including matters involving RAAF Base Amberley and Archerfield SIDs.
- David Diamond asked about expected feedback timelines from Package 3. Donna said this would depend on submission numbers.
- Janelle commented that a “delay slide” with a timeline would be helpful. Jacqui confirmed Airservices would consider this.
- Janelle noted her community regarded this as the worst consultation that had been undertaken so far under the Noise Action Plan for Brisbane, expressing a view that her community did not get a genuine opportunity to be consulted on, that slots for consultation sessions were very limited.

Actions

4. Airservices to advise whether Package Four’s multiple route options is focussed on only arrival routes or if departures would also be considered, and if so why, and whether Package Four respite modes would be high capacity.
5. Airservices to provide public communications around Phase Six consultation outcomes and next steps, including when a report would be available, when outcomes could be implemented, and further detail on Package Four.
6. Tess Bignell to provide further detail of community feedback on Phase Six consultation processes for Airservices’ information.

Agenda Item 6: Airservices Update

The Chair noted that this item had been discussed during *Agenda Item 3A* and *Agenda Item 5*, and moved on to the next item.

Agenda Item 7: BAC Update

Tim Boyle presented the item.

Draft Master Plan 2026 consultation

Tim provided an update on public consultation activities for the Brisbane Airport draft Master Plan (dMP) 2026, noting that the Master Plan was publicly released on 4 August 2025.

The group also discussed the item:

- Janelle Moody and David Diamond expressed concern that residents directly impacted by aircraft noise had not been directly notified of the Master Plan consultation.
- David Diamond emphasised that BAC had a social and moral obligation to provide this information to impacted communities
- Janelle added that if she were not on the AAB, she would not have known about it.
- Tim noted that the consultation process being conducted was consistent with requirements under the *Airports Act 1996*.
- Henry Tuttiett explained that BAC had reached out through multiple channels, including radio, newspapers, and public events. He noted that a letterbox drop would not add significant value.
- Janelle expressed a view that notification processes were inadequate.
- Kim noted letter box drops had not been well received in the consultation process on the Melbourne Airport M3R major development planning process, and ask that Janelle consider providing suggestions on what other communication channels should be used.
- Matt Loveday noted that figures included in the Master Plan generally reflected best-case scenarios and stressed the importance of transparency. As an example, Matt highlighted that references to Chapter 14 compliance in Chapter 12 of the dMP were framed to only included international movements, excluding domestic passenger and freight operations, giving a misleading impression of overall aircraft performance.
- Matt also raised community concerns about language and assumptions used across planning documents, with the Noise Action Plan for Brisbane emphasising de-concentration, while the dMP outlined a projected doubling of passenger movements between 2026 and 2046.
- Matt also highlighted the importance of acknowledging night freight and SODPROPS constraints while exploring early turn options for relief.
- Tim responded that while he understood Matt's intent, the Master Plan process was not the appropriate forum for such detailed operational matters.
- Sarah Nattey clarified that Master Plans are reviewed by the Department under statutory requirements and must meet legislative content requirements under the Act. Additional detail that was not needed in the Master Plan could be provided separately through website publications. She confirmed a Master Plan's primary purpose is to demonstrate to the Commonwealth, as landowner, how the asset will be used, and that the airport is meeting its requirements under the lease and the Act.
- Sarah added that broader community-facing stories could be shared, and while the AAB has a defined role around aircraft noise impacts, other stakeholders are also engaged in consultation on Brisbane Airport's medium-to-long-term planning.
- The Chair thanked Sarah and observed that a Master Plan is strategic in nature and therefore covers matters broader than the AAB's remit.
- Steve Muller suggested consultation invitations should be placed prominently to ensure awareness.
- Henry noted the Master Plan includes a chapter on Noise and Airspace Operations and there was an open invitation to the community to provide feedback over the 2.5 month consultation period.

- Henry added journalists had been given full access to the Plan and the opportunity to ask questions of BAC.
- The Chair requested that BAC provide a breakdown of questions raised by journalists at the next AAB meeting.
- Tess suggested BAC advertisements should make clear that increased noise impacts are expected, as this would prompt greater engagement.
- Tim confirmed that under the Act, BAC must prepare a supplementary report consolidating all community feedback, and detail how that feedback had been considered and acted upon, which is provided to the Minister alongside the draft Master Plan.

Tail wind safety case update

- Tim provided an update on the proposed tail wind safety case trial.

Action

7. BAC to provide breakdown of questions raised by journalist around the Master Plan at the next AAB meeting.
8. BAC to provide notice when public information on tailwind safety case trial has been released.

Agenda Item 8: Departmental Update

The Chair passed over to departmental representatives to present the item.

Action Item 8.1 – Departmental site visit

Sarah Nattey reported she and Andrew Marshall visited a variety of sites impacted by aircraft noise on 27 and 28 August 2025. Rachel Lee accompanied them on 27 August 2025.

The visit included New Farm, Bulimba, Morningside, and Woolloongabba, with the department prioritising parks to hear noise without any insulation.

Sarah mentioned their key observations included:

- Aircraft type and size have a clear impact on noise, with jets producing different outcomes compared with propeller aircraft.
- Altitude is also an important factor, as was whether a plane was climbing or descending, with impacts varying between suburbs.

Sarah emphasised the visit had been a helpful and informative exercise, acknowledged the input of the Secretariat, who had compiled the itinerary in consultation with Airservices and BAC, and thanked Janelle Moody for suggesting the site tour.

Janelle thanked the department for undertaking the site tour, and reporting back to the group.

AAB Operational Review (and Terms of Reference)

Sarah noted the AAB Terms of Reference provide that the Minister periodically reviews the operation of the AAB. Minister King has recently agreed to an approach to consultation to inform this review.

Sarah advised a survey would shortly be distributed to AAB members to seek feedback to inform Minister King's review. The survey will also be an opportunity to provide feedback on the current Terms of Reference.

Sarah noted Tess's paper (included as *Attachment* D) identifies the potential to include noise abatement procedures within the AAB's Terms of Reference, which was the sort of feedback that would be sought through the survey to inform the review.

Sarah then clarified the purpose of departmental participation in the AAB:

- Sarah attends meetings because, while she oversees regulation of 21 leased federal airports nationally, the AAB (and implementation of the Noise Action Plan for Brisbane) is a priority for the Minister;
- Sarah emphasised that she largely attends as an observer. While she could not necessarily speak to the views of the Minister on policy matters, the department does provide advice to the Minister;
- Andrew Marshall oversees regulation of multiple airports across Queensland, the Northern Territory and South Australia, as well as overseeing Part 5 of the Airports Act 1996 (focussed on land use planning and building controls) and Part 11 of the Airports Act 1996 (focussed on control of activities such as liquor, commercial trading, vehicle operation, gambling and smoking on airport sites);
- Rachel Lee supports regulation of airport land use planning, and performs a strategic policy role in relation to Part 5 and Part 11 of the Act, alongside supporting AAB secretariat activities; and
- Tara Ironside acts as the Secretariat for the AAB, alongside supporting regulatory activities.

Sarah emphasised the department values engagement with the AAB, noting that it was one of few forums that the department regularly attends nationally due to resource and travel constraints.

Steve queried whether the Minister reads all correspondence sent by members of the public.

In response:

- Sarah outlined how the Minister's Office and the department typically manages Ministerial correspondence: Ministerial replies are drafted by the department, reviewed by departmental liaison officers and Ministerial advisors, then signed by the Minister.
- Sarah confirmed Minister King reads all material presented to her, including draft Master Plans submitted for her consideration (alongside detailed assessments undertaken by the department to support decision making), and that statutory timeframes for Ministerial decisions are carefully and closely managed.

Matt commented that it would be beneficial for the Minister to attend an AAB meeting to speak directly with community members.

Senate Inquiry into Impact and Mitigation of Aircraft Noise

Sarah provided an update on the Australian Government's consideration of recommendations from the final report from the *Senate Inquiry into Impacts and Mitigation of Aircraft Noise*. Sarah noted a draft response to the final report has been provided to the Government for consideration, and that the final response would be published when the Government had finalised its consideration.

Sarah noted the draft response had been developed in consultation with Airservices and other relevant Australian Government agencies.

Agenda Item 9: Other Business

Noting the time, the Chair led discussion of the agenda item and began winding down the meeting.

The Chair apologised to Luke Van Dongen and David McCutcheon for not having sufficient time for their agenda item, which could be presented at the next meeting, and thanked the airline representatives for the value and technical expertise they bring to the AAB.

Before closing the meeting, the Chair thanked Henry Tuttiett and Alex Tikoft for their attendance, and welcomed their contributions to the meeting.

The next AAB meeting is scheduled for Wednesday 19 November 2025.

The Chair thanked members for their participation and closed the meeting at 15:04.

Attachment A

Open Action Items

No.	Meeting Date	Item	Requirement	Responsible Person	Completion Date	Status
1.1	18 May 2023	Route Growth Forecasts	AAB to work with Brisbane Airport Corporation (BAC) and Airservices on how to better provide information and data on expected aircraft movements, and previous and proposed impacts.	BAC Airservices Australia		Updated provided at meeting #9. Airservices published 2024 figures for information alongside Phase 6 Consultation. BAC has not yet published route growth forecast maps. Item to remain open until maps are published.
3.4	22 November 2023	Independent Assurance	Chair and Donna Marshall to discuss scope of works for Airservices' independent technical advisor for quality assurance. Airservices to task independent technical advisor, Think, to develop a research paper exploring the best metrics to understand noise reduction (in terms of sharing, concentration, and mitigation), and looking at the positives and negatives for each metric.	Chair Airservices Australia		Update provided at meeting #9. Airservices and Think Research will provide a briefing to Community Representatives out of session on metrics work.
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,	Airservices Australia BAC		Update provided at meeting #9. Airservices and Think Research will provide a briefing to Community Representatives out of session on metrics work.

No.	Meeting Date	Item	Requirement	Responsible Person	Completion Date	Status
			concentration, and mitigation), and looking at the positives and negatives for each metric.			
5.1	9 September 2024	Opportunities to reduce noise impacts from airline operations	Airline representatives to bring ideas about reducing noise impacts from their operations to the next AAB meeting.	Qantas Virgin	Ongoing	Update provided at meeting #9. Presentation on fleet upgrades has been deferred to meeting #10.
8.2	22 May 2025	Examine D'Aguilar National Park	Airservices to review potential use of area over D'Aguilar National Park and report back to the AAB.	Airservices	Before next meeting.	Airservices requested further information from the Secretariat and will report back at or before the next AAB meeting.
9.1	27 August 2025	Noise metrics briefing	Airservices and Think Research to provide out of session briefing on noise metrics. The Secretariat will support with scheduling the session.	Airservices Secretariat	September 2025	New Item.
9.2	27 August 2025	NCIS complaint response examples	Janelle Moody to provide examples of complaint responses to the Secretariat for sharing with Airservices.	Janelle Moody		New Item.
9.3	27 August 2025	Revised KPI and outcomes data	Airservices to revise presented KPI and outcomes data presented based on the group's feedback, and circulate revised data and proposed approach to publishing the information out of session.	Airservices		New Item.
9.4	27 August 2025	Package Four queries	Airservices to advise whether Package Four is focussed on arrival routes, and if so why, and whether Package Four respite modes would be high capacity.	Airservices		New Item.
9.5	27 August 2025	Phase Six communications	Airservices to provide public communications around Phase Six	Airservices		New Item

No.	Meeting Date	Item	Requirement	Responsible Person	Completion Date	Status
			consultation outcomes and next steps, including when a report would be available, when outcomes could be implemented, and further detail on Package Four.			
9.6	27 August 2025	Phase Six community feedback	Tess Bignell to provide further detail of community feedback on Phase Six consultation processes for Airservices' information.	Tess Bignell		New Item.
9.7	27 August 2025	Draft Master Plan media queries	BAC to provide breakdown of questions raised by journalist around the Master Plan at the next AAB meeting.	BAC		New Item.
9.8	27 August 2025	Tailwind safety case – public notice	BAC to provide notice when public information on tailwind safety case trial has been released.	BAC		New Item.

Closed Action Items

No.	Meeting Date	Item	Requirement	Responsible Person	Completion Date	Status
7.3	26 February 2025	Community question and answer documentation	Secretariat to develop document outlining responses to common questions by community members for publication on the AAB website.	Secretariat Chair	May 2025	Closed
8.1	22 May 2025	Departmental site visit	Secretariat to engage with Janelle and Donna (Airservices) to coordinate a site visit for departmental representatives to demonstrate aircraft noise impacts on the community.	Secretariat Department	When departmental team is next in Brisbane.	Closed

No.	Meeting Date	Item	Requirement	Responsible Person	Completion Date	Status
8.3	22 May 2025	SIDs adherence visualisation	Airservices to consider how the presented SIDs adherence information could be updated to be more impactful for communities. Community Representatives may provide any further feedback to support this thinking to the Secretariat for sharing with Airservices.	Airservices	Future AAB meeting.	Closed.
8.4	22 May 2025	Emirates departures	BAC to further discuss Emirates departure on 23 March 2025 with Emirates, after Tess Bignell confirms flight details.	BAC Tess Bignell	Before next meeting.	Closed.
8.5	22 May 2025	Noise Sharing Factsheet	Airservices to develop a high-level factsheet better explaining noise sharing ahead of public consultation on preferred options for Package Three. Chair and Airservices to further discuss what high level information around noise sharing would be useful for the community to inform this work.	Airservices Chair	Before public consultation on Package Three preferred options	Closed.
8.6	22 May 2025	Updated program schedule	Airservices to provide an updated program schedule that shows where there has been delay or slippage in delivery and give some explanation for this, which Community Representatives may share publicly.	Airservices	Before next meeting	Closed
8.7	22 May 2025	Package Three – briefing on preferred design	Airservices to provide out of session briefing to Community Representatives on preferred options for Package Three ahead of public consultation. The Secretariat will support with scheduling this session.	Airservices Secretariat	Before public consultation on Package Three preferred options	Closed

No.	Meeting Date	Item	Requirement	Responsible Person	Completion Date	Status
8.8	22 May 2025	Senate Inquiry into impact and mitigation of aircraft noise – AAB views	Community Representatives to consider recommendations in the final report from the *Senate Inquiry into impact and mitigation of aircraft noise*, whether or not they agree with the recommendations, and any feedback they would like to be conveyed through the department. These views are to be provided to Kim and the Secretariat for consolidation.	Community Representatives	Before next meeting	Closed
8.9	22 May 2025	Brisbane Airport draft Master Plan – advance copy and briefing session	BAC to distribute draft Master Plan for AAB information (likely in July 2025), and then offer a question and answer session. The Secretariat will support with scheduling this briefing session.	BAC Secretariat	Before next meeting	Closed