SUNSHINE COAST

PROPOSED AIRSPACE AND FLIGHT PATH CHANGES FOR RUNWAY 13/31

FLIGHT PATH FORUM FAQS

1. **Please advise and provide details of each of the alternate flightpath routes that were considered prior to the selection of the flightpaths described in the EIS.**

   Please refer to the Sunshine Coast Council Concept Design document.

2. **Please supply and describe the key elements of safety and community impact comparative analysis undertaken for these alternate routes.**

   Please refer to the Sunshine Coast Council Concept Design document.

3. **Please describe all of the required the elements of ASA's submission to CASA.**

   The Airspace Change Process, including the form for submission is located on the CASA website; https://www.casa.gov.au/airspace/airspace-regulation/airspace-change-process

4. **Please detail all of the changes to any inputs to the noise modelling undertaken for the TEIA from the EIS inputs.**

   Aside from the updated flight path design, the targeted EIA was carried out with the objective that the assumptions remain consistent with the EIS, insofar as they were representative of the present operating conditions at the airport. This includes adopting the same aircraft noise model being the integrated noise model (INM) and files used in the EIS modelling as far as practicable.

   The assumptions that informed the targeted EIA have been documented in **Appendix A** of the targeted EIA and are summarised below.

   Regular public transport

   Aircraft movements in the EIS were reviewed and compared against more recent aircraft movement data for 2017/18. More recent aircraft movement data provided by Airservices showed movements earlier in the morning (i.e. 6–7 am) and later at night (i.e. 8–p pm). The more recent movement data was adopted as they were considered more representative of present operating conditions.

   The aircraft fleet in the EIS was similarly reviewed and compared against the 2017/18 data. There were some differences in the more recent data including a higher proportion of A320-200 and 717-200 aircraft and lower proportion of ATR72-500 and DHC-8 aircraft. Again, recent data was adopted to reflect present operating conditions.

   Runway allocations for runway 18/36 were allocated based on the 2017/18 movement data, while runway allocations for future runway 13/31 were estimated based on two years of recent meteorological data.

   General aviation

   Assumptions regarding general aviation were generally adopted as per the EIS. However, a review of 2017/18 data indicated there had been a substantial reduction in helicopter movements to those assessed in the EIS (to about 20%). This assumption was therefore revised to reflect the present reduction in helicopter movements.

Overall, while the objective was to remain consistent with the EIS as far as practicable, a number of updated assumptions were made to represent present operating conditions at the airport. Nonetheless, the general consistency of the findings of the targeted EIA and the EIS, indicated that the sensitivity of the assessment to these assumptions was relatively limited.

5. Please describe and supply all of the input assumptions and parameters to the noise modelling undertaken for the TEIA (we understand that the Noise modelling consultants have supplied a report containing all of this information).

Refer to answer to Q4

6. **Please detail all of the aircraft that are proposed to be departing to the north-west**.

After opening of the new runway, aircraft may depart to the north-west or to the south-east depending on the runway mode of operation.

Based on meteorological data, it is expected that aircraft would most often depart to the south-east (Runway 13) rather than the north-west (Runway 31). Regular public transport aircraft that do depart to the north-west would then turn east to cross the coast and then south over water toward common destinations such as Sydney or Melbourne.

Regular public transport aircraft that would continue to the north-west would be limited to generally smaller aircraft flying regional routes, such as a Fokker 70 flying to Emerald as modelled in the targeted EIA. Such regional flights were predicted to occur less than once per day on average in the targeted EIA.

7. Please describe all of the aircraft that are proposed to be landing from the north-west.

After opening of the new runway, any operating aircraft may arrive from the north-west or to the south-east depending on the runway mode of operation.

Based on meteorological data, it is expected that aircraft would most often depart south-east (Runway 13) and land from the north-west (Runway 13).

As above, aircraft would typically first approach from the east before landing from the north-west. Aircraft approaching further from the north-west would be limited to generally smaller aircraft flying regional routes such as a Fokker 70 flying from Emerald as modelled in the targeted EIA. Such regional flights were predicted to occur less than once per day on average in the targeted EIA.

8. What is the "standard departure profile" that has been adopted in the INM?

As documented in Appendix A of the targeted EIA, the aircraft that were assessed to most frequently use the flight paths (A320-200 and 737-800) had a INM default departure profile of about 7 percent (%).

9. What INM thrust profile adjustments are proposed?

Thrust profile adjustments were made for future aircraft in the longer term scenario that were not already included in INM. As documented in Appendix A of the targeted EIA, this included:

A320neo — A320-232 (-3.3 departure/-2.4 arrival)

A321neo — A321-232 (-3.5 departure/-1.1 arrival)

737 MAX — 737-800 (-4.2 departure/-2.3 arrival)

10. What alternate noise sharing options have been considered?

Airservices will examine a range of noise abatement procedures for the proposed final flight path designs. Noise sharing options are not being considered as part of this process.

11. Why has the fleet profile been based on a conservative financial model rather than an environmental impact model of total aircraft traffic?

As documented in the EIS, aircraft movements and fleet were based on forecasts, aimed to provide a realistic forecast of airport traffic. As discussed above, a number of assumptions in the EIS were updated in the targeted EIA including aircraft movements and fleet.

12. What is the difference in noise profile of a DH-8 and a 717?

Boeing 717-200 aircraft are generally louder than De Havilland Canada Dash 8 aircraft. On arrival, a 717-200 aircraft is less than 2 dB louder than a De Havilland Canada Dash 8 aircraft.

However, on departure a 717-200 is almost 10 dB louder, owing to its jet engines as opposed to the turbo propellers of the De Havilland Canada Dash 8.

13. Please describe all of the differences between the input assumptions and inputs to the noise modelling for the TEIA and the EIS.

See above response to question 4.

14. Why did ASA not use a more current and accurate noise model for the TEIA (ie AEDT rather than the outdated INM)?

The EIS was modelled using the INM. The justification for aligning the EIS and targeted EIA was to ensure a reasoned comparison of the results could be undertaken.

15. How will the flight paths shown in the fact sheets apply to GA and helicopter traffic?

The flight paths in the fact sheets related to IFR aircraft operations. General aviation and helicopter traffic would continue to fly based on individual flight plans and destinations rather than on formalised flight paths both before and after the opening of the runway.

16. Please confirm the total annual air traffic movements (separately for Commercial, GA and Helicopters) incorporated into the TEIA modelling (2020 and 2040).

The targeted EIA assessed a "busy day" of airport traffic – a day on the 90th percentile of the days in 2017/2018. The assessed schedules of airport traffic have been documented in Appendix A of the targeted EIA. In summary the "busy day" included:

2020

- Commercial — 33 flights
- General aviation — 87 flights
- Helicopters — 39 flights

2040

- Commercial — 73 flights
- General aviation — 106 flights
- Helicopters — 47 flights

17. Please confirm whether all noise modelling incorporated into the TEIA is based on the full range of aircraft types that form part of the estimated annual air traffic.

The targeted EIA included an aircraft fleet based on a review of 2017/18 data, as documented in Appendix A of the targeted EIA.

18. Please confirm what air traffic volumes are still assumed to use the north south runway in the TEIA (2020 and 2040).

Regular public transport would utilise the new runway exclusively. As documented in the EIS and targeted EIA, fixed wing general aviation would also utilise the new runway except where restricted due to meteorological conditions.

19. Please advise why all of the metrics in the TEIA are presented in a form that are not comparable with the EIS despite the DoEE requirement for comparison between these two documents.

The noise contour information presented in the targeted EIA included metrics that were used in the EIS. Specifically, in relation to the advice from the Department of Environment and Energy, ANEC and N70 contours were provided and were compared with the findings of the EIS.

20. Please confirm the data sets used for population and dwelling counts used to inform the TEIA.

The targeted EIA utilised the most recent population data from the Australian Bureau of Statistics, retrieved in December 2018. The population data was then spatially distributed within the suburbs analysed based on State of Queensland address point data.

21. Do you envisage the EIS at OAR resulting in a request to complete the CASA form 080 – or will you be supplying the 2014 EIS in support of the ACP?

It is not envisaged that a form 080 will be completed. The TEIA will be supplied with the ACP. The EIS will not be supplied.

22. Was the TEIA an internal process only or was it a requirement for the ACP package?

The TEIA is used for internal purposes and will be supplied with the ACP.

23. Please confirm the date the TEIA was begun, the date it was completed and the date at which advice was sought from the Minister for Environment and or Minister for Infrastructure and Transport.

The TEIA was commenced on 18 January 2019, it was completed on 25 February 2019.

We will respond to the Minister for Environment and Energy in accordance with the advice, once the design is finalised.

24. Was the TEIA the sole document presented to the Department of Environment and Energy as the information on which any advice was to be sought/considered?

The EIS was the document presented to the then DoE (Cth).

25. We understand that the Consideration of Feedback Report is currently being finalised – but it would appear the final flight path design will be presented on 5 July. Please confirm how much time Airservices have allowed to meaningfully consider all feedback prior to finalising the flight path design and why the final flight path design has been completed prior to the consideration of feedback being finalised into a report.

Airservices has taken time to register, analyse and consider all feedback received during the consultation period. Where feedback related to flight path designs, this has been considered in the context of the proposed final designs. This has occurred between end of April and early July 2019.

The preparation of the Consideration of Feedback Report summarises the criteria and processes used.

26. How did you undertake the population counts for the TEIA? Was a 3km band with used or were all dwellings within a suburb used to inform dwelling data inputs?

See above response to question 20.

The population within the full extent of all of the suburbs analysed was considered. No specific bands were applied to narrow the area.