

**GOLD COAST AIRPORT – SOUTHERN
OPERATIONS
NOISE IMPROVEMENT INVESTIGATION
Draft Report – Response to Feedback**

31 March 2023

1 RESPONSE TO FEEDBACK

No.	Comment	Response
1	Thank you for the meeting last Thursday and leading this to finally happen. I commend the collaborative approach taken and the open and transparent dialogue with Matt and Nigel. Could you please pass on my many thanks to them both.	Noted
2	I accept the reasoning and explanations on the subject matters of the draft report. The honesty relevant to the use of RWY H140 over Kingscliff also being relevant to long-haul aircraft was much appreciated and what we always believed to be a factor.	Noted
3	If such a meeting like last week had occurred more than 12mths ago as advised to ANACC and CACG was to be held, and then in email from AA was to be held week of 14 th Feb. a lot of time, resources and frustrations could have been avoided. The written submission to AA 2/11/21 on the initial draft report was never acknowledged, nor responded to. This issue is in no way directed to you, Matt or Nigel.	Noted
4	Re the progressing of Proposal 4, the offset over water, I remain of the view that through the process it is important reference is made to this track being aligned to the former instrument approach.	<p>The “former instrument approach” referenced is a depiction of flight paths published to the Gold Coast Airport website. The flight path “32 Instrument” represents the VHF Omni-Directional Range (VOR) approach for RWY 32.</p> <p>The Required Navigation Performance (RNP) and VOR are different types of aircraft approaches and are subject to different design criteria and cannot be aligned.</p> <p>RNP provides more accurate tracking compared to the VOR approach. Accordingly, RNP provides a better (lower) minima than the VOR. RNP provides an approach aligned with the centreline whereas it is rare to have a VOR aligned with the centreline. This offset for the VOR is added complexity for a pilot when close to landing.</p>

No.	Comment	Response
5	Re my query on the historical data (pg.22) of the RWY H140 to N/E destinations being consistent 2012/14/16 at 6-8% over Kingscliff but then with all RWY 14 departures reducing from 2016 numbers to the 2019 numbers but significantly increasing to 20% usage over Kingscliff correlates to increases of larger aircraft and long-haul routes (greater pay/fuel loads) which from forecasts is to continue to increase.	Noted
6	RWY H140 was historically used on occasions for operational purposes and prior to 2017 was not a designated flight path. The flight paths as understood by the community are on GCA's website. The key issue is that it suddenly appeared in the GCA Master Plan 2017 (MP) as an existing flight path with zero consultation with the ANACC and zero process/environmental assessment.	<p>H140 is not a designated flight path, but rather a tactical heading used by Air Traffic Control to safely manage aircraft movements. The procedure is the GOLD COAST SIX DEPARTURE (RADAR):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jet aircraft are to track runway heading until at or above 600 feet but not before 2 nautical miles Distance Measuring Equipment (DME). • They are then to turn onto an assigned heading or track. <p>Assignment of departure headings is discussed further in proposal 2 on page 24.</p>
7	Relevant to the AA presentation to the CACG meeting 24/3/22, 2021 noise complaints in review which advised complaints for Tweed Heads were for training when I had been provided the response to a resident from NCIS on a complaint re RPT Dec. 2021. This was a non-compliant movement. As you requested at the meeting last week for me to provide details, it is Case (removed)	<p>Noted, however this is not feedback on the Southern Operations Noise Improvement Investigation Report.</p> <p>We have requested examples of this data to investigate further through the ANACC.</p>
8	There are numerous numbers of such movements but many of them are not logged correctly on WebTrak, instead being logged many hundreds of metres from where they have actually tracked and has been ongoing since the end of 2016. I believe this failure is impeding noise complaints from being properly considered and is distorting the noise complaint system resulting in outcomes that are not representative of what is actually occurring.	<p>Noted, however this is not feedback on the Southern Operations Noise Improvement Investigation Report.</p> <p>We have requested examples of this data to investigate further. This is being tracked through ANACC actions.</p>
9	Post the RWY 14 trial and subsequent change to the way point 2016, along with the increase in larger aircraft and long-haul routes the Tweed communities have been experiencing a significant change in aircraft noise and tracking of aircraft.	Noted

No.	Comment	Response
10	<p>There are some significant issues with the current GCA MP on the noise/contour components and the southern members are seeking to have these matters properly addressed in the new MP currently being developed. I have raised these above matters as per the Federal regulations AA is “the endorser” of ANEFs and need to be satisfied the appropriate elements of aircraft types, flight path data, contour modelling etc has been provided.</p>	<p>Noted. Airservices will endorse the ANEF giving regard to all relevant matters as per the required process.</p>
11	<p>Thank you for the proposed SOR draft report which is version 0.3 of Gold Coast Airport – Southern Operations Noise. Improvement Investigation Report.</p> <p>I have read the report and found it to be thorough and reflecting the comments made in our meeting of the 24/11/22.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
12	<p>The comments I would like make relate to the meetings held on 4 November 2020 on 10 November 2020, as noted on page 4 of this report. These meetings were not held face-to-face and were held online and the key point I would make is that there was no presentation or discussion of results.</p>	<p>Noted & updated report.</p> <p>Section 2 (Background) updated to reflect meetings were virtual.</p> <p>The results are now presented in the final report.</p>
13	<p>We were presented with a report result with very poor explanation, and certainly not the detail that has since been provided.</p>	<p>Noted. Airservices had taken learnings from this process and will apply them moving forward.</p>
14	<p>It was a result of this lack of detail and subsequent attitude “if you don’t like it, go to the ANO”, that our community representatives contacted the ANO for their involvement in the matter.</p> <p>Please keep up this level of collaboration.</p>	<p>Noted. We will continue to engage with communities with the aim of fully resolving any issues or suggestions.</p>
15	<p>P 4 BACKGROUND</p> <p>The Southern Representatives identified that planes were departing over Kingscliff in 2015. When Airservices was asked why, (in both the ANACC and CACG meetings), no reason was given despite frequent requests over many years.</p>	<p>Airservices acknowledges the timeframe taken to provide this information.</p>
16	<p>P 5 After dot point 5 – February 2021</p> <p>Finally, an explanation was given. The Southern Representatives wrote a response to (removed) (from Airservices). We requested a written</p>	<p>Noted</p>

No.	Comment	Response
	response to the errors and conclusions stated in the document. This was never sent to us.	The final report documents the detailed investigation into each proposal and addresses feedback received throughout the investigation.
17	24 March 2022 – “finalized” Airservices tried to avoid further discussion by claiming that the topics were “finalized” but the Southern Representatives disagreed and requested a further meeting.	Noted
18	20 October 2022 – Airservices showed a slide which had nothing to do with the topics being discussed.	The presentation used on 20 October 2022 included a dedicated slide for each proposal discussed in the SOR report. These were discussed after an update on noise monitors and an Instrument Landing System (ILS) Standard Arrival Route (STAR).
19	P 12 Figure 8 – using data from during Covid – no longer relevant. Figure 9 – as above.	Noted. We have requested that the Aircraft in Your Neighbourhood website is updated with more recent “flows”. This change will be reflected on the Aircraft in Your Neighbourhood website.
20	P17 2nd dot point Why is NZ not using this? Figure 14 is from 2019. (<i>Why are flights from NZ not using the RNP-AR</i>)	Date noted. Proposal 3, which will progress for further investigation and community engagement, will see increased usage of the RNP Y RWY 32 (AR). It is worth noting that AR approaches can only be flown by CASA-authorized pilots and approved aircraft. NZ airlines that are authorised to conduct the approach will be able to conduct the approach. Further information on the usage of this approach will be provided through community engagement on the offset RNP-AR proposal due to commence in early 2023.
21	P 18 4.6.4 – We support the “offset” approach. Can the “straight-in” over Kingscliff also use the offset?	Noted. Further information on the usage of this approach will be provided through community engagement on the offset RNP-AR proposal due to commence in early 2023.
22	P 21 & 22 - Statistics would have been more useful.	Noted. We will consider this feedback in planning the community engagement on the offset RNP-AR proposal.

No.	Comment	Response
23	P 27 - Agree with the conclusion. P29 - Agree with the conclusion.	Noted
24	What % of planes will be cargo flights departing over Kingscliff?	It is difficult to forecast the percentage of cargo flights that will depart H140, as this heading is only used when operationally required.
25	Will the cargo flights depart during daylight hours to reduce the departure noise over the sleeping Kingscliff residents?	Aircraft departure scheduling is determined by the Airport and airlines and is not something Airservices can provide information on.
26	Will daylight saving be taken into account for the timing of departing and arriving cargo aircraft over Kingscliff?	Aircraft departure scheduling, including any daylight-saving considerations, is determined by the Airport and airlines and is not something Airservices can provide information on.
27	What % of planes will be using the “offset” rather than the “straight-in” approach?	Further information on the usage of the RNP Y RWY 32 (AR) (offset RNP-AR approach) will be provided through community engagement due to commence in early 2023.