

Airservices Response to Additional Questions and points for clarification - 23.07.19

5. Please confirm that the noise modelling assumes only a 0.1 nautical mile (185m) dispersion of ALL arrival aircraft from the centreline of the proposed flight paths for the entirety of the flight paths.

A dispersion of 0.1 nautical miles has been applied to the proposed arrival flight paths.

6. Please confirm that the noise modelling assumes a 1 nautical mile (1,852m) dispersion of ALL departure aircraft from the centreline of the proposed flight paths for the entirety of the flight paths

A dispersion of up to 1 nautical mile was applied to the proposed departure flight paths. The dispersion is gradual because deviation from flight paths is more likely further from the runway.

12. Please explain how flight drift and possible deviations from planned air routes has informed noise modelling studies.

Flight drift is taken into account in the noise model as dispersion as discussed above.

17. Please confirm the runway alignment/bearings used in the preparation of noise modelling for the TEIA and the EIS.

The runway orientations in the EIS and the targeted EIS are both oriented 13/31.

19. Please explain how aircraft altitudes have been used to inform noise modelling.

The altitude of an aircraft at a given point on a flight path is based on known altitude profiles for a given aircraft incorporated in the noise model.

25. Please identify the section of the EIS which documents the result of assessments of noise, social, economic and environmental impacts on areas that are in the sub-5,000ft zone. A zone which by the admission of the authors of the EIS will be subjected to "significant noise impact".

The targeted EIA has assessed the potential noise impacts of the proposed change including areas at which aircraft would be below 5,000 feet.

Detailed noise contours are provided as Appendix C to the targeted EIA.

27. Can you please explain the land zoning categories shown in Figure 32 in the TEIA. A number of suburbs have been shown as rural – rather than rural residential. Specifically, Peregian Beach, Weyba Downs, Verrierdale, northern section of Yandina Creek. Please advise land zoning for areas north of Tinbeerwah where overflight will be below 5000ft – as they have been chopped off the top of the map.

Land zones shown in Figure 32 of the targeted EIA are based on Queensland Government data. Areas zoned as rural were nonetheless assessed as rural residential in the targeted EIA. Areas north of Tinbeerwah were not mapped as they are outside the mapped N60 contours.

28. Please advise how topography has been factored into impact assessments and how these findings have informed flight path design – such as the ridge at Yandina Creek, Lake Weyba, Lake Cooroibah, Sunrise Road at Doonan etc.

The noise model incorporates topographical data from NASA Shuttle Radar Topography Mission.

30. Please explain ASA's decision to employ GHD consultants to prepare the TEIA and how ASA concluded that independent verification, evaluation and conclusions could be assured by using the same consultants who prepared the 2014 EIS.

GHD is a leading environmental and engineering firm. The EIS was prepared by the Sunshine Coast Council as the proponent for the coordinated project.

35. Please refer to ASA's response to question 26 of FPF's Questions and points for Clarification From Airservices submitted on 2 July. ASA states that no specific bands were applied to narrow the area of dwelling counts. It must be assumed then that every dwelling in each overflowed suburb would be affected by 'varying degrees of aircraft noise'.

A factsheet presented by ASA at the Verrierdale hall drop-in session gave dwelling counts under each of the flight paths – the total on the factsheet was 4452 dwellings for areas within a 3km band under each flight path. If we apply ASA's spatial distribution methodology then all dwellings within an overflowed suburb should be counted as the entire suburb is then deemed affected as per the Minister's advice, above.

A conclusion we could then reach is that the number of dwellings affected would be far greater than the 3520 as stated in the TEIA. Please explain how ASA's findings are consistent with the Minister's advice in this instance.

The targeted EIA included dwelling counts within predicted N60 and N70 noise contours, rather than a buffer applied to flight paths.

57. Please explain why the Additional Information to the EIS has not been referenced in the TEIA.

The targeted EIA made a number of references to the EIS including the 'additional information' or 'further information' as appropriate.

For example, section 11 of the targeted EIA compares the ANEC and N70 contours in the 'additional information' and 'further information' to the contours in the targeted EIA respectively.

58. Please advise how environmental considerations for Lake Weyba (DIWA listed) which is a MNES is' consistent with the EIS', when it's not discussed in the EIS?

As shown in Appendix E of the targeted EIA the proposed flight paths in the EIS and the targeted EIA both would pass over Lake Weyba.

Chapter D5 of the EIS stated “suburbs that would experience new over flights when the new runway is operational include ... Weyba Downs (inc. Lake Weyba)” while Lake Weyba was shown beneath the LAmax single event contours in Chapter D3 .

While Lake Weyba is listed on the Directory of Important Wetlands in Australia (DIWA), it is not a Ramsar wetland and consequently is not a Matter of National Environmental Significance (MNES).

59. Please justify the use of a suburb level comparison been used rather than metric when it is clear there are increased impacts at a dwelling level.

The targeted EIA included an analysis at the suburb level as well as dwelling counts within predicted N60 and N70 noise contours.